A

DISCOURSE

Concerning the DOCTRINE

OF

Chriſt's Satisfaction.

Wherein

The *Antinomian* and *Socinian* Controverſies about it, are truly Stated and Explained.

In Anſwer to Mr. *Lobb's Appeal*, and to ſeveral Letters from the *Diſſenting Parties* in *London.*

PART II.

By the Right Reverend Father in God *EDWARD* late Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter.*

LONDON,
Printed by *J. H.* for *Henry Mortlock* at the *Phœnix* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1700.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE BOOKSELLER TO THE READER.

THIS Second Diſcourſe concerning the *Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction*, was left prepared for the Preſs by the Right Reverend and Learned Author under his own Hand-Writing, except the Two laſt Heads mentioned in the Third Chapter of the Contents, which he was prevented from

finiſhing, by that Diſtemper he labour'd under, and which at laſt put an end to his Life. However it was thought convenient, that this ſhould be publiſhed as it is, rather than the World ſhould be deprived of any thing written by ſo great a Man; and as this finds Acceptance it may incourage the Printing of ſome other Manuſcripts his Lordſhip left.

Henry Mortlock.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

THE Bishop of Worcester's *Letter to Mr.* Dan. Williams. page 1

Several Letters from and to Mr. Lobb. p. 27

The Bishop of *Worcester's* Answer to Mr. *Lobb's* Appeal.

CHAP. I.

Of the true occasion of the present Differences among the Dissenters about

The CONTENTS.

about the Antinomian *and* Socinian *Controverſies.* p. 38

CHAP. II.

The Myſtery of Antinomianiſm *laid open from Dr.* Criſp's *Writings.* p. 73

CHAP. III.

The State of the Socinian *Controverſy Explain'd, with reſpect to the preſent Differences among the Diſſenters about it.* p. 140

(1.) *About Chriſt's Sufferings being a Proper Puniſhment for our Sins.* p. 141

(2.) *Of the Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, and of Chriſt's Suffering in our ſtead.* p. 173

* (3.) *Of*

The CONTENTS.

* (3.) *Of Christ's Suffering under the Obligation, and by Virtue of the Sanction of the Law of Works.*

* (4.) *Of the true Notion of Imputed Righteousness, and our Justification thereby.*

ER-

ERRATA.

PAge 60. l. 20. r. *renouncing*. P. 92. l. 14. r. εἰκότως. P. 104. l. 6. r. *and legally having it past*. P. 127. l. 24. r. *that latitude in it*. P. 142. l. 17. r. *and how far Mr. W.*

A LETTER *from the Right Reverend Dr.* Stillingfleet, *late Biſhop of* Worceſter, *in Anſwer to one from Mr.* Williams, *who deſired his Judgment as to the following Queſtions; becauſe his Lordſhip's Book is in the firſt Paper, and the Report pleaded againſt Mr.* Williams.

SIR,

I Return you Thanks for the Papers you were pleaſed to ſend me; by which I am able to Underſtand ſomething more than formerly, of the Preſent ſtate of the Difference about *the Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us:* But I ſhall meddle no farther in it than I am obliged to do in Anſwer to the Queſtions you propoſe to me. And I wiſh I may be able to do any ſervice therein.

The firſt is about *my ſenſe of Commutation of Perſons.* It is ſaid in the firſt Paper, *That I do with* Grotius *expreſly affirm, and irrefragably prove it with the common ſentiment of Proteſtants, and that the Doctrines of Juſtification and Chriſt's Satisfaction, cannot be duely Explained and Defended conſiſtently with the denial of any Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Believers.*

This had been fairly repreſented, in caſe there could be no other ſenſe of *Commutation of Perſons* than what is aſſerted by Dr. *Criſp*, but there is a threefold ſenſe of it, very different from each other.

1. Such a Change of Perſons, as implies that One is Appointed and allowed to act on behalf of others, and for their Advantage; and this ſort of Commutation of Perſons the *Socinians* never denied; as I have ſhewed in the Diſcourſe of *Satisfaction*, p. 62, 190, 191. It is not therefore the uſe of the Words, but the ſenſe of them is to be enquired into. For ſome may affirm a Change of Perſons, and yet be *Socinians*; and

In 8vo ſecond Edit.

and others may deny a Change, and be far enough from *Socinianiſm*, according to the ſenſe in which they are underſtood.

2. Such a Change of Perſons as ſuppoſes One to be ſubſtituted in the Place of others, to become an Atonement for them in order to their Redemption and Deliverance. And when ſuch a ſubſtitution is by the Will of God and Conſent of the Perſon who ſuffers; here is a Real Change of Perſons as to that Particular End which is deſigned by it. And in this ſenſe I did aſſert a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, becauſe by the will of the Father and his own Conſent, he became a Sacrifice of Propitiation for our Sins in order to their Remiſſion, and our Reconciliation with God on ſuch terms as are declared in the Goſpel; as may be ſeen at large in the Diſcourſe already mentioned, particularly *Ch.* 4. *Sect.* 4.

3. Such a Change of Perſons as implies an Actual Tranſlation of the Perſonal guilt of all the Sins of Believers on Chriſt, and his Perſonal

The firſt is about *my ſenſe of Commutation of Perſons.* It is ſaid in the firſt Paper, *That I do with* Grotius *expreſly affirm, and irrefragably prove it with the common ſentiment of Proteſtants, and that the Doctrines of Juſtification and Chriſt's Satisfaction, cannot be duely Explained and Defended conſiſtently with the denial of any Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Believers.*

This had been fairly repreſented, in caſe there could be no other ſenſe of *Commutation of Perſons* than what is aſſerted by Dr. *Criſp*, but there is a threefold ſenſe of it, very different from each other.

1. Such a Change of Perſons, as implies that One is Appointed and allowed to act on behalf of others, and for their Advantage; and this ſort of Commutation of Perſons the *Socinians* never denied; as I have ſhewed in the Diſcourſe of *Satisfaction*, p. 62, 190, 191. It is not therefore the uſe of the Words, but the ſenſe of them is to be enquired into. For ſome may affirm a Change of Perſons, and yet be *Socinians*; and

In 8vo ſecond Edit.

and others may deny a Change, and be far enough from *Socinianism*, according to the ſenſe in which they are underſtood.

2. Such a Change of Perſons as ſuppoſes One to be ſubſtituted in the Place of others, to become an Atonement for them in order to their Redemption and Deliverance. And when ſuch a ſubſtitution is by the Will of God and Conſent of the Perſon who ſuffers; here is a Real Change of Perſons as to that Particular End which is deſigned by it. And in this ſenſe I did aſſert a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, becauſe by the will of the Father and his own Conſent, he became a Sacrifice of Propitiation for our Sins in order to their Remiſſion, and our Reconciliation with God on ſuch terms as are declared in the Goſpel; as may be ſeen at large in the Diſcourſe already mentioned, particularly *Ch.* 4. *Sect.* 4.

3. Such a Change of Perſons as implies an Actual Tranſlation of the Perſonal guilt of all the Sins of Believers on Chriſt, and his Perſonal

Righteouſneſs on them, without regard to any conditions on their Part, but merely by the free Grace and Favour of God. And this I take to be Dr. *Criſp*'s ſenſe of the Change of Perſons; of which I ſhall diſcourſe when I come to the laſt Queſtion.

But the Authors of *the firſt Paper*, and of *the Report*, p. 4. ſeem to take it for granted that there can be but one Senſe of Commutation of Perſons; wherein they do not diſcover their profound Knowledge in theſe matters, if they thought ſo; or their Ingenuity, if they knew otherwiſe, and deſigned to impoſe upon thoſe who did not. For it appears that there is a Senſe in which it may and ought to be denied, without the leaſt prejudice to the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction. Although *that cannot be Explained or Defended without* ſome kind of *Commutation of Perſons*; yet it very well may and ought to be Defended without and againſt Dr. *Criſp*'s ſenſe of it, as will be made appear afterwards.

The

The Author of the *Report*, p. 5. ſaith, *This is the very Hinge on which the Controverſie between the Orthodox and Socinian doth turn*; which ſhews him to be not very deeply skilled in it; for *the hinge of the Controverſie* is not about the Words, but the ſenſe of *Commutation of Perſons:* and even the ſenſe is not the Original Controverſie, but Conſequential, upon our aſſerting Chriſt's Sacrifice to be a Propitiation for our Sins; for upon this they ask how the Act of one Perſon can be ſo Beneficial to others? and to that we anſwer, that although one Man's Act cannot become anothers, yet if by conſent both of the Father and Son, he becomes our Mediator, and ſuffers in our ſtead, in order to our Reconciliation, then as to that end and purpoſe, here is *a Change of Perſons:* for whereas in ſtrictneſs we ought to have ſuffered the Deſert of our own Sins, God was pleaſed to accept of his ſuffering inſtead of ours, and ſo by vertue of that Propitiation we hope for the Remiſſion of Sins and the Favour of God, according to the terms of the

Goſpel. And therein conſiſts the true Controverſie between the *Socinians* and us, *viz.* Whether the ſufferings of Chriſt were to be conſidered as a Puniſhment for our Sins, and as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God for them, or only as an act of Dominion over an Innocent Perſon in order to his advancement to glory.

But it is ſaid in the *Report*, p. 5. *That if there be no Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us, there can be no tranſlation of the Guilt, nor a juſt infliction of the Puniſhment of our Sins on Chriſt; that is, there can be no proper Satisfaction.*

To this I anſwer, that there is a twofold Tranſlation of Guilt to be conſidered.

1. Of the Perſonal Guilt, which reſults from the Acts of ſin committed by ſuch Perſons. If this guilt be tranſlated, Chriſt muſt become the very Perſon who committed the ſins; and ſo he muſt be looked on not only as an actual Sinner, but as the Perſon that committed all the Sins of thoſe for whom he died: which comes

comes ſo near to horrid Blaſphemy, that I wonder Perſons that bear any Reverence to our Bleſſed Saviour do not abhor the very thoughts of it.

2. Of *Legal Guilt*, which lies in the Obligation to Puniſhment, by vertue of the Sanction of the Divine Law. Now this Guilt implies two things:

1. The Deſert of Puniſhment which follows Perſonal Guilt, and cannot be transferred by a Change of Perſons; For no man can ceaſe to deſerve Puniſhment for his own faults; nor deſerve that another ſhould be puniſhed for them.

2. The Obligation to undergo the deſerved Puniſhment, but becauſe the execution of Puniſhment depends both on the Wiſdom and Juſtice of the Legiſlator; therefore here a Change of Perſons may intervene, and by the wiſdom and juſtice of God a Mediator may be accepted in ſuch a manner as himſelf determines, and upon the Acceptance of his Sacrifice the Offenders may be pardoned and receïved into the Grace and

Favour of God, on ſuch Terms as he hath declared in the Goſpel. And in this ſenſe the guilt of our Sins was charged upon Chriſt as our Mediator, who was to bear the Puniſhment of our ſins; ſo as by vertue of his ſufferings, we may not only hope to eſcape the juſt Puniſhment of our Offences, but to be admitted into the Privileges of the Children of God.

But the *Reporter* out of a certain *Manuſcript* gives another Account of *Commutation of Perſons*, viz. *That Commutation in a legal ſenſe is the ſame with a proper ſurrogation, where the ſurety puts on the Perſon, and ſtands in the quality, ſtate and condition of the Debtor, and lies under the ſame obligation to anſwer for him.*

But this I have ſhewed long ſince to be a very wrong Notion of Chriſt's Satisfaction: and which in effect gives up the Cauſe to the *Socinians:* For if ſins be conſidered as Debts, God may freely forgive them (without diſparagement to his Wiſdom and Juſtice) without any Satisfaction; and the right of Puniſhment then

then depends on God's abſolute Dominion; and Satisfaction muſt be by way of Compenſation; of which I have treated at large, *Ch.* 1. *Sect.* 2. *ult.* But I cannot but wonder at the learned Author of the *MS.* that he doth at the ſame time aſſert our ſins to be conſidered as *Debts*, and the *Neceſſity of vindictive Juſtice:* For, what *vindictive Juſtice* belongs to a *Creditor?* May not a *Creditor* part with his own Right, and forgive what and whom he pleaſes, without any violation of Juſtice? I can hardly think, that thoſe who write ſo rudely and inconſiſtently, ever penetrated into theſe Matters in their own thoughts; but only take up with a ſet of Phraſes and common Expreſſions among thoſe they converſe with, which they look on as the ſtandard and meaſure of Truth about theſe Matters.

But he finds fault with ſome men *who hold that Chriſt only ſuffered in the Perſon of a Mediator, and not in the Perſon of Sinners.* What is the meaning of this? I had thought, that a Mediator interpoſing for that end,

end, that by his ſufferings there might be a Propitiation for ſins, did ſo far *ſuſtain the Perſon of Sinners*, as to take upon himſelf the puniſhment of their ſins, and procure Grace and Favour for them. But if he means any thing beyond this, he muſt explain himſelf. *Chriſt ſuffered in the Perſon of Sinners.* Is it that he ſuffered that others might not ſuffer? That is not denied by thoſe who *ſay that Chriſt ſuffered in the Perſon of a Mediator.* For a Mediator is a publick Perſon, and acts in the ſtead and on the behalf of others; and if this be called *ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*, I ſuppoſe they will not quarrel with the expreſſion. But if more be meant by it, *viz.* that the perſonal Guilt of ſinners, in Dr. *Criſp*'s ſenſe, is transferred upon Chriſt, that they have to deny; as I hope to make it appear in anſwer to the third queſtion.

The ſecond Queſtion is, *Whether the Author of Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, viz. *Mr.* Williams *be chargeable with* Socinianiſm *in what he ſaid*, p. 37. 40?

The

The charge ſtands thus in the *Report*, p. 4. *That he ſaith, there is no Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Sinners:* which is there ſaid to be *inconſiſtent with the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction; which muſt ſuppoſe a Commutation of Perſons. And therefore he that denies any Change, cannot aſſert the Doctrine of Satisfaction.*

This is the force of the Objection. And being deſired to give my Opinion of it, I examin'd and compar'd ſeveral paſſages in that Book, that I might judge truly and impartially concerning it. And I found the Author, *p.* 3. ſaying concerning the difference with Dr. *Criſp*, *That it was not whether Chriſt had made full Atonement for ſin*; which he thereby owned to be his ſenſe. And, *p.* 7. more fully he owns, *That our ſins were imputed to Chriſt with reſpect to the Guilt thereof; ſo that he by the Father's appointment, and his own conſent, became obliged as Mediator, to bear the puniſhments to the full ſatisfaction of Juſtice and to our actual Remiſſion when we believe.* Can any thing be more clear and expreſs againſt

gainſt *Socinianiſm* than this? There are other paſſages, *p.* 10, 19, 28, *&c.* to the ſame purpoſe, but theſe are ſufficient to ſhew, that he could not abſolutely deny any Commutation of Perſons.

But in what Words doth he deny it? For it is poſſible there may be ſuch Words uſed as may reſtrain and limit the ſenſe; and then it is very hard to force ſuch a ſenſe upon them, as is inconſiſtent with what he had ſaid before, for no man loves to contradict himſelf; eſpecially when he knows what advantage will be taken by it. The words are theſe, *p.*40. *The difference lies in theſe points.* 1. *Whether there be a change of Perſon between Chriſt and the Elect? Yea, or betwixt Chriſt and Believers. This the Doctor affirms, and I deny.* How can any perſons, in common Ingenuity, underſtand this otherwiſe, than that he denied ſuch Change of Perſons, as Dr. *Criſp* affirmed? But againſt this it is urged by the Author of the MS. in the *Report*, p. 81. *That his denial of a Change of Perſons, is ſo expreſs and full, as leaves no room*

for

for any diſtinction, limitation or reſtriction, or for an owning it in any ſenſe. What! not in the ſenſe that himſelf had owned it in before? This is very hard; eſpecially when he mentions *what the Doctor affirmed and he denied.* There is a very good paſſage to this purpoſe in the firſt Paper, mentioned in the *Report*, *p.* 12. *Not thinking it reaſonable or juſt to charge upon any Brother ſuch Conſequences of any Expreſſion or Opinion of his, which he himſelf ſhall diſown.* Why then ſhould ſuch a ſenſe be charged upon him, which he diſowns at the ſame time? There muſt be ſomething farther in this matter, than appears to an indifferent and impartial Reader; what it is, is no part of my buſineſs to enquire.

But that which muſt give the beſt light into it, will be the reſolution of the laſt Queſtion.

The third Queſtion is, concerning Dr. *Criſp*'s Senſe of the *Change of Perſons*, whether it be true or falſe? Which, I ſuppoſe, is truly ſet down by the Author of *the Goſpel-Truth ſtated*; in theſe words, *p.* 38. *Mark it*

it well, Chriſt himſelf is not ſo compleatly righteous, but we are as righteous as he; nor we ſo compleatly ſinfull, but Chriſt became, being made ſin, as ſinfull as we: Nay more, we are the ſame righteouſneſs; for we are made the righteouſneſs of God; that very ſinfulneſs that we were, Chriſt is made that very ſinfulneſs before God. So that here is a direct Change, Chriſt takes our Perſon and Condition, and ſtands in our ſtead, and we take Chriſt's Perſon, and ſtand in his ſtead.

Here is indeed *a Change of Perſons* ſuppoſed, but I do not find it proved; and therefore is only to be looked on as an *imaginary Change*, which it is poſſible for Men to fanſie; but that is no ground to build a matter of Faith upon; and ſuch as the Salvation of their Souls is ſo nearly concerned in. But to deliver my Opinion freely and diſtinctly about it, I ſhall ſhew,

1. That it hath no Foundation in Scripture.

2. That it is contrary to the Tenour of it, and the terms of Salvation contained in the Goſpel.

3. That

3. That it is attended with very bad conſequences, which naturally follow from it.

1. That it hath no Foundation in Scripture. For which I deſire it may be conſidered, that our bleſſed Saviour himſelf in all his Preaching, who came to reveal the Will of God to Mankind, ſaith nothing at all of it: and can any poſſibly think that he would omit ſuch a point, wherein, I perceive, ſome do think *the ſubſtance of the Goſpel* is contained? All that our Saviour ſaith to this purpoſe, is, *That he came to give his Life a Ranſom for many*, Mat. 20. 28. and that *his Blood was ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of ſins*, Mat. 26. 28. What other *Change of Perſons* is here implied, but that of *a Ranſom*, and *a Sacrifice of Propitiation?* He that knew beſt for what end he ſuffered, ſaith not one word of his taking upon himſelf the *Perſon of ſinners*, in any other ſenſe than as he ſuffered in their ſtead, and for their advantage. Here is nothing like *his being as compleatly ſinfull as we*; *and our being made as righteous*

as

as he. And yet certainly he communicated to his Diſciples thoſe points on which their Juſtification and Salvation depended. But how could they apprehend any ſuch *Change of Perſons* in this ſenſe, from any words uſed by himſelf to them? And all neceſſary points of Faith were delivered by our Saviour to his Diſciples: And therefore to make ſuch a Change of Perſons neceſſary, and yet not mentioned by him, is to charge him with failing in his prophetical Office, which all thoſe ought to conſider, who lay ſuch ſtreſs upon this matter.

But doth not St. *Paul* ſay, *that God hath made him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him?* 2 Cor. 5. 21. I grant he doth ſo. *But do not theſe words imply ſuch a Change of Perſons as Dr.* Criſp *aſſerts?* By no means, Which I thus prove: Dr. *Criſp's* Notion of *the Change of Perſons*, ſuppoſes the benefits of this Change to be antecedent to any conditions on our ſide, *viz.* that it was by a Tranſaction between the Father and

and the Son, without regard to any act of ours: But when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *Chriſt's being made ſin for us, and our being made the righteouſneſs of God in him*, he ſuppoſes, that before we can have the benefit of it, we muſt be firſt *reconciled to God*, which is an act on our part. For to this purpoſe he ſaith, *v.* 18, 19. that after *the Reconciliation* made by Chriſt at his Death, he had given to the Apoſtles *the Miniſtry of Reconciliation*. To what purpoſe? Was it only to let them know what Chriſt had already done for Mankind? That were to ſet up a *Miniſtery of Conſolation for Believers*; but not of *Reconciliation*. But the Apoſtle lays great force upon it, *that God had committed to them the word of Reconciliation*. *Now then*, ſaith he, *we are Ambaſſadors for Chriſt, as though God did beſeech you by us, we pray you in Chriſt's ſtead, be ye reconciled to God*, v. 20. They were by this *Miniſtery of Reconciliation*, after what Chriſt had done and ſuffered, *prayed*, and with great earneſtneſs, *to be reconciled to God?* To what end?

if according to *this change of perſons*, they were *more than reconciled to God already*, if they were true Believers; for they were *as righteous as Chriſt himſelf*, and therefore muſt be in the Grace and Favour of God. If they were not Believers, then, according to this Scheme of *the change of perſons*, they could have no benefit by it; and conſequently, *this Miniſtery of Reconciliation*, is wholly ſubverted, as to the great purpoſe and deſign of it. For either they were *reconciled* already, or they never could be. And yet the Apoſtle, after thoſe words, *v.* 21. immediately ſubjoyns, *ch.* 6. 1. *We then as workers together with him, beſeech you alſo, that ye receive not the Grace of God in vain.* What can the meaning of theſe words be, if Dr. *Criſp*'s ſenſe of the *change of perſons* hold good? Can they who are *compleatly righteous*, ever *receive the Grace of God in vain?* And to what purpoſe doth he ſpeak of *their working together with God*, and *beſeeching them* not to do a thing utterly impoſſible? For it would be to undo what had

long

long ſince been done between the Father and the Son in *the change of perſons*. So that this Notion of *the change of perſons* is as different from St. *Paul*'s, as may be; for that ſuppoſes no conditions on our ſide; and the *Miniſtery of Reconciliation in St. Paul*, is wholly founded upon it, and really ſignifies nothing, as to the ends he propoſes without it. For to what purpoſe is that appointed to perſwade men to be *reconciled to God*, if all that ever ſhall be admitted to Heaven were long ſince reconciled at the death of Chriſt, and they were made as *compleatly righteous as Chriſt himſelf?*

It may be ſaid, *That the Miniſtery of Reconciliation is not uſeleſs, becauſe it is the means whereby God doth effectually convey his Grace into the hearts of Believers.* But this cannot ſatisfie any one that conſiders St. *Paul*'s expreſſions: For his words are, *We pray you in Chriſt's ſtead, be ye reconciled to God.* If he had ſaid, *That God had made Chriſt to be ſin for you already, and you as righteous as Chriſt was*; how would it have looked to

have ſaid after this, *We pray you to be reconciled to God?* For what need they any *Reconciliation*, who were already ſo much in his favour?

But is there no Change of Perſons then implied in thoſe words of St. Paul; *Who made him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him?* Yes certainly. Such a *change*, whereby Chriſt did undergo *the puniſhments of our ſins*; and ſo *Eraſmus* obſerves, *that Chriſt is not called a ſinner here*, as Dr. *Criſp* would have it, but *ſin*; i. e. *a Sacrifice for ſin, according to the Scripture-ſenſe: And we are made the righteouſneſs of God in him*, i. e. That God upon the account of his Sacrifice, and our Reconciliation to him, would treat us as righteous perſons; or receive us into his Grace and Favour; which is all that I can find that St. *Paul* underſtood by this expreſſion.

2. I am now to ſhew, that this Notion of the *change of perſons*, which Dr. *Criſp* aſſerts, is contrary to the whole Tenour of the Scripture, and the terms of Salvation con-

contained in the Goſpel. I am ſenſible how large a field I am entred upon: And if I ſhould purſue this matter as it deſerves, it would take up much more room than I can allow to this Anſwer. I could eaſily prove that in all the Tranſactions between God and Mankind, ſome conditions on our ſide were required in order to his favour. So it was in the ſtate of Innocency; ſo it continued after Man's fall, as appears by thoſe remarkable words of God to *Cain*; *If thou doeſt well, ſhalt thou not be accepted? If thou doeſt not well, ſin lieth at the door*, Gen. 4. 7. So it was in God's dealing with the *Patriarchs*, and the moſt excellent perſons in the Old Teſtament, *Abraham*, *Moſes*, *David*, *Job*, &c. But I paſs over theſe, (although I ſuppoſe they will not be denied to have been of the *Elect*, and to have had the benefit of *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* as well as Chriſtians) and come to the terms of Salvation, as declared by Chriſt himſelf. Let any one ſeriouſly peruſe the Doctrine which he preached from the time, *when he be-*

gan to preach, and to ſay, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, Mat. 4. 17. And he ſhall find the main buſineſs of his Preaching was to put men upon performing ſuch conditions, as were neceſſary to their Salvation, and for that reaſon. As may be ſeen in his Sermon on the Mount, in which he begins with promiſing Bleſſedneſs to the *humble, merciſull, pure in heart*, Mat. 5. 3, 4, *&c.* What do theſe things mean, if they be not conditions on our parts neceſſary in order to Happineſs? And that they are conſidered by God as ſuch? Why doth he ſay, *Except your Righteouſneſs exceed the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall in no caſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. 5. if ſuch a Righteouſneſs be not a condition required in order to ſuch Entrance? And if it be, no *change of Perſons* without inward and real Righteouſneſs can be ſufficient. Our Saviour doth not ſpeak of what will be *eventually* in ſome perſons, but of what is required to be done in order to an end. And therefore he concludes his

his Sermon with ſaying, *Whoſoever heareth theſe ſayings of mine and doth them, I will liken him to a wiſe man, who built his houſe upon a rock*, &c. Mat. 7. 24. Not he that believes that he is one of thoſe who is made *compleatly righteous by a change of perſons*, without any change of temper or diſpoſition of Mind: He never promiſes the leaſt degree of Happineſs to ſuch; but ſtill inſiſts on our own endeavours, *By ſtriving to enter in at the ſtrait gate, which St.* Paul *calls, working out our own Salvation with Fear and Trembling, and St.* Peter, *giving all diligence to make our Calling and Election ſure. For*, ſaith he, *If ye do theſe things ye ſhall never fall.*

Do not theſe expreſſions note the neceſſity of the performance of conditions on our ſide? And therefore all imaginary Notions of ſuch a *change of perſons*, as hath no regard to any acts of ours, is wholly repugnant to the main Scope and Deſign of the Goſpel. I meddle not with the diſpute about the Moral

Law, which must continue to oblige us as long as the reason of it continues; but the main argument to me is from the Gospel, as it is delivered by Christ and his Apostles, who certainly understood the *Substance and Design* of it far better than Dr. *Crisp*, or the *Reporter* doth. What was transacted between the Father and the Son, we know no more than they have revealed to us; and we know they had no design to impose upon Mankind, by laying so much weight upon such conditions as God had no regard to; and by concealing from them such a *change of persons*, as made them *compleatly righteous* without any act of theirs. Men could never be reconciled to the just Veneration and Esteem we have of the Sacred Penmen of the Scriptures, nor to their Knowledge of the Mysteries of the Gospel, nor to their Fidelity in declaring them for the good of Mankind. So that if we find nothing of this *change of persons* in their Writings, and so much as is utterly inconsistent with it,

it, we have all the reaſon in the World to reject it.

This Notion of the *change of perſons* is attended with very bad conſequences. Which I do not charge on thoſe who do not ſee them, or are carried by ſome higher Principles above them; but we are not to judge of Perſons but of Things, and the natural Tendency of Principles.

And ſo the *Change of Perſons* in this ſenſe hath theſe very bad Conſequences: That it is apt to leſſen our Reverence of the Divine Perfections; our juſt ſenſe of the differences of Good and Evil; Our Obligations to all ſorts of Duties; it tends to the Diſparagement of that *free Grace* they pretend to exalt; and expoſes the Goſpel to the Reproach and Contempt of Infidels, and leaves the Minds of thoſe who embrace it, under Great Temptations to *Preſumption*.

Theſe things I can only mention, becauſe you deſired a ſhort Anſwer to

to your Queſtions, and I have brought it into as narrow a Compaſs as I could.

I am, Sir,

Nov. 18. 97.

Your Faithfull Friend and Servant,

ED. WIGORN.

Mr.

Mr. St. Lobb's *First Letter*, Nov. 18. 1697.

My Lord,

THere being a Controverſie among Diſſenters about the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction, ſome of the moſt eminent among them; [ſuch as Dr. *B.* Mr. *H.* *&c.* did, in a Paper ſent to ſome other Brethern for Conciliation, mention your Lordſhip's ſenſe about the aſſerting a Commutation of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, as neceſſary to a due Explanation, and Defence of the ſaid Doctrine: and on the other hand, there is another of Eſteem among us, who is for caſting off the Phraſe of a change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us, allowing only a change of Perſon; upon which, he ſaith, your Lordſhip hath put an honeſt ſenſe,

ſenſe, *viz.* a Subſtitution of one Perſon in the room and place of another. Your Lordſhip's Judgment therefore being referred unto, it will be a moſt Chriſtian part, if you ſhall condeſcend to give us your impartial thoughts of this point, as being likely, on both hands, to be ſo received as to compoſe the difference between us.

I am the more earneſt in this, becauſe I ſee, that ſome are labouring to make Chriſt's Sufferings ſo merely voluntary, as not to be pœnal, or not properly pœnal, but improperly and materially ſo: and our Sins not to be the impulſive, or not the near impulſive meritorious Cauſe of them.

There being no other end in ſending this, I hope, your Lordſhip will both pardon and anſwer the Requeſt of,

My Lord,
Your Lordſhip's moſt obedient
Servant, and ſincere Honourer,

Stephen Lobb.

An-

Anſwer to Mr. St. Lobb's *Firſt Letter,* Dec. 12. 1697.

SIR,

YOur Letter, which bears date, *Nov.* 18. came not to my hands till *Dec.* 10. and in the mean time, I doubt not, but you have ſeen my Letter to Mr. *W.* wherein I have given my ſenſe of the things which are mentioned in yours; and that with great freedom and impartiality, after I had peruſed the Papers on both ſides which came to my hands. And I heartily wiſh you had ſent me your Letter after you had ſeen mine, that I might have removed any difficulties you apprehend therein: For I deſire to prevent all needleſs, as well as dangerous Controverſies among thoſe who truly own the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction. And I cannot think a form of words capable of a very bad ſenſe

is

is to be inſiſted ſo much upon; although others may have uſed it in a good ſenſe. And therefore there is no need to diſpute your Authorities about the Sound and Orthodox Senſe ſome Divines have uſed thoſe Expreſſions you mention in: but the plain ſtate of the Caſe at preſent is this.

Dr. *Cr.* hath aſſerted ſuch *a change of Perſons* between Chriſt and Believers, from whence all the *Antinomian* Principles do neceſſarily follow; as *that God ſeeth no ſin in his People, that no conditions are required on our parts to make us partakers of the benefits of Chriſt's Sufferings; that Juſtification is before Faith*, &c. This Senſe of the change of Perſons was denied, as it ought to be, by Mr. *W.* but allowing what is underſtood by it, as to Chriſt's undergoing the Puniſhment of our Sins: upon this, he is accuſed as rejecting ſuch a change of Perſons as is neceſſary to maintain the Doctrine of Satisfaction; this, I confeſs, appeared to me very hard and unreaſonable proceeding; as I have ſhewed in my Letter.

Letter. But I perceive by the Papers you ſent me, that you diſown the *Antinomian* Principles, which I was glad to find; and therefore you cannot but diſown ſuch a change of Perſons from whence they follow; or elſe you muſt ſhew, that thoſe Principles do not follow from it, which I think you will hardly do.

Sir, I am ſo far from thinking you need to ask Pardon for your writing to me about ſuch matters, that I ſhall be glad to hear farther from you, and to underſtand what your Senſe is of my former Letter to Mr. *W.* as well as of this. For by what I can obſerve from the ſeveral Papers, it is a fondneſs for Dr. *Cr.* Notions, which lies at the bottom of all theſe heats; which ſeems to me to have been the true reaſon why thoſe Propoſitions were not condemned, which were taken out of his Books, and of others of his way.

I cannot but look on thoſe *Antinomian Doctrines*, as of very dangerous conſequence, to all that underſtand them, as well as to thoſe who do not. But

But I find by what you affirm of your ſelf, that all thoſe who oppoſe Mr. *W.* are not for Dr. *C*s Notions; and as to ſuch there is nothing but a miſ-underſtanding of each other, which may be eaſily rectified; if perſons be inclined to think well of one another.

I am, Sir,

Your Faithfull Friend and Servant,

E. W.

Mr.

Mr. Lobb's *Second Letter*, Dec. 18. 1697.

My Lord,

ON a Peruſal of your Letter to Mr. *W.* I was abundantly ſatisfied, in what you write about a Commutation of Perſons, the guilt of Sin, and your Confutation of Dr. *Criſp*; only I wiſhed your Information had been more full than I perceive it was; for then you would have ſeen, that the Authors of the *firſt Paper*, and *the Report*, are not for a Commutation of Perſons in the Senſe of Dr. *C.* That your Lordſhip therefore may have a fuller ſtate of matters in Controverſie among us, I have prepared ſome Sheets for the Preſs, in which I have given the true Reaſons of the Diſſatisfactions of ſome with Mr. *W.* directing it to your Lordſhip; becauſe you have ſo clearly ſtated our true Senſe about

Christ's Satisfaction. It is almost finished, and I send you this humbly to beg your Lordship's Pleasure, whether I shall send it unto you now in MS. or not till Printed.

My Lord, My hopes are, that God will bless your farther endeavours for composing our Differences, at least in the point of Satisfaction about which I am mostly concerned.

Your's of the 12th came to my hands this Evening, for which I render your Lordship my humblest Thanks.

In the Papers above-mentioned, you will see my sense of your Letter to Mr. *W.*

That Dr. *C.* hath asserted such a change of Persons between Christ and Believers, as from whence all the *Antinomian* Principles do necessarily follow, as that God seeth no Sin in his people; that no conditions are required on our parts to make us Partakers of the benefit of Christ's Sufferings; that Justification is before Faith, *&c.* we entirely agree with your Lordship, whilst we are necessitated to dissent from you in what

what you add about your Charity to Mr. *W.* not doubting, but that we ſhall be able to evince, that it is not a fondneſs for Dr. *C*'s Notions, that lieth at the bottom of all theſe Heats. The true Reaſon why the Propoſitions were not condemned, you will find in the Papers prepared for the Preſs, in which your Lordſhip will alſo obſerve, why the controverted Phraſes are rejected by Mr. *W.* and Mr. *A.* I will wait for your Lordſhip's Commandments, being,

My Lord,

Your moſt Obedient Humble Servant,

Stephen Lobb.

Anſwer to Mr. St. Lobb's *Second Letter*, Dec. 22. 1697.

SIR,

I Am very glad my Letter to Mr. *W.* gave you any Satisfaction, as to the point of Commutation of Perſons, *&c.* Only you wiſh I had received fuller information of ſome matters of fact; which was a thing out of my power; and I could only judge by what I had ſeen. By the firſt Paper it did appear to me, that Mr. *W.* was charged with denying ſuch a Commutation as was neceſſary to explain the Doctrine of Satisfaction; whereas he only denied ſuch a change as was affirmed by Dr. *C.* If there be any thing more in Mr. *W*'s caſe, I ſuppoſe I ſhall ſee it in the Papers you are preparing for the Preſs; which I ſhall be glad to ſee when they are printed. I would not have you give your ſelf the

the trouble to ſend them before. For ſince they relate to matters of fact I can be no competent judge of them.

I am very well pleaſed, to find that you diſown Dr. *C*'s *Antinomian* Principles: I think you would do your ſelves a great deal of right to condemn the Propoſitions which they inſiſt upon. For I had ſome reaſon to believe, that they were too much favoured by ſome of your Brethren; but I ſhall not be ſorry to find my ſelf therein miſtaken.

I am, Sir,

Your Faithfull Friend and Servant,

E. W.

An Anſwer to Mr. Lobb's *Printed* Appeal.

CHAP. I.

Of the true occaſion of the preſent Difference.

SIR,

I Have read and conſidered your *Appeal*; and I am very willing to do my endeavours in order to the compoſing thoſe *differences* among you, which relate to the *Antinomian* and *Socinian Controverſies*; and which I think cannot be ended without a clearer underſtanding of the *true ſtate* of both of them. For, if I be not much miſtaken, the one hath given occaſion to the other; and if the juſt bounds between them be duely ſetled, the pre-

preſent diſpute about the ſignification of ſome doubtfull Words and Phraſes, will fall to the ground, (as I hope to make it appear in the Progreſs of this Diſcourſe.) And I ſhall be heartily glad to contribute any thing towards the leſſening *any needleſs as well as dangerous Controverſies among thoſe who truly own the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction*; ſince it is now out of my power to *prevent* them.

But it was a *Civility* greater than I had reaſon to expect, that you ſhould in the beginning of your *Appeal, render me your unfeigned thanks*, not only for what relates *to the Article of Satisfaction, but for my Confutation of Dr.* Criſp: ſince I had intimated to you in one of my Letters, that I apprehended, that a fondneſs for his Notions lay at the bottom of all theſe Heats. And I cannot ſay, that my opinion is alter'd by your Appeal; of which I ſhall preſently give my Reaſons.

But I muſt firſt take notice, that you tell me, that *I have not been ſo fully acquainted with the matters in*

difference as could be wiſhed. Truly, when I wrote my Letter to Mr. *W.* I went chiefly upon the *Report*, which you had publiſhed; and I thought I might rely upon it. But I find ſince, ſome of your Brethren charging it with *Diſingenuity, Prevarication, and Partiality*, (*Reb. p.* 3.) but I ſaw no cauſe to ſuſpect any ſuch thing, as to what I was concerned in; which was the giving an Anſwer to the *three Queſtions* propoſed to me. But wherein is it, that I have ſhewed my ſelf *not ſo fully acquainted with the matters in difference among you.* Is it, that I ſay, *that the Authors of the firſt Paper, and the Report ſeem to take it for granted, that there can be but one Senſe of Commutation of Perſons?* But if you reflect upon the uſe made in the *Report* of Mr. *W*'s denying *a Commutation of Perſons, as Dr.* Criſp *had affirmed it*; that therefore *he muſt deny ſuch a Commutation as is eſſential to the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction*; you will eaſily perceive, that the whole force of this Reaſoning depends upon this, that he that denies it in any

Anſw. to the *Report*, p. 1.

Senſe

Senſe, muſt deny it in all. Which I ſhewed to be very unreaſonable, ſince there may be and are ſuch different Senſes of it. For there is a Senſe, as I ſaid, wherein it may and ought to be denied, without the leaſt Prejudice to the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction; and although that cannot be explained and defended without ſome kind of Commutation of Perſons, yet it very well may and ought to be defended, without and againſt Dr. *Criſp*'s ſenſe of it. For in one of your Letters, you grant, *That the Antinomian Doctrines do neceſſarily follow Dr. C's Notion of the change of Perſons:* Either then, they muſt be owned to be true, or his ſenſe of it muſt be falſe. But you deny the former, and therefore you muſt yield the latter, and confeſs, that Mr. *W.* had reaſon to deny the change of Perſons in his ſenſe. But of this more afterwards.

Or, do you think it argues, *my not being ſo fully acquainted with the matters in difference among you*; becauſe I intimated, *That I ſuſpected a fondneſs for* Dr. Criſp's *Notions lay at*

at the bottom of all theſe Heats? I muſt deal ſo freely with you, as to let you know, that the way you have taken to remove this Suſpicion hath confirmed me in it. You put me at firſt in very great hopes of ſeeing an effectual Confutation of it; for you ſay, *That the condemning the Propoſitions by your Brethren will evince the contrary.* This is indeed to the purpoſe. But where is this *Condemnation* to be ſeen? I hoped to find it in your *Appeal*, or at the end of it. But I was utterly diſappointed; and inſtead of it, you tell me, *p.* 43. that the reaſon why they had not done it, was, " That none of " the 49, whoſe names were to " the Teſtimonial before Mr. *W*'s " Book, called *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, " had recalled their hands; or ex- " preſſed ſo much Diſ-ſatisfaction " with what he had aſſerted, as was " expected: Beſides, you ſay, Ha- " ving ſince diſcourſed ſeveral of " them, you find them very willing " to declare their diſlike of the Pro- " poſitions, and you are perſwaded " they will chearfully do it (but " when?)

" when?) whenever ſatisfaction " ſhall be given to what Mr. *W.* is " charged with. And is this the *condemning the Antinomian Doctrines*, which you promiſed? This only relates to *ſome*, *whom you diſcourſed with*; and even theſe are for putting it off to the longeſt day; or till Mr. *W.* confeſſes he hath wrongfully denied *Dr.* C*'s change of Perſons*; i. e. they will renounce *Antinomianiſm*, when Mr. *W.* confeſſes himſelf to be an *Antinomian:* For you grant, he cannot own *Dr.* Criſp*'s ſenſe of the change of Perſons, but the Antinomian Doctrines muſt follow from it.* I do not by this intend to call in queſtion your Sincerity in oppoſing *Antinomianiſm*; for you have declared it ſo often and in ſuch a manner, that I muſt think very hardly of you, if I thought you could conceal a *fondneſs* for that Doctrine under ſuch expreſſions againſt it. For you not only tell me, that you have formerly written againſt it; but you ſpeak againſt ſome of the Doctrines of it with *great Indignation*, *p.* 8. and you have ſeverely rebuked ſome of your Brethren for trimming

trimming too much in favour of *Antinomianiſm*; and ſay, *That you refuſed to ſet your Name to the new Impreſſion of Dr.* Criſp's *Sermons (when others did it who now blame you) becauſe it looked like giving too much countenance to the Notions in them.* So that I do not at all queſtion your Zeal againſt *Antinomianiſm*; and I do ſuppoſe ſome more of your acquaintance may be of your Mind. But that which ſticks with me is, that the *firſt Heat* which began among you, was upon that *new Impreſſion of Dr.* Criſp's *Sermons*, which hath continued ever ſince, but not managed ſo openly as at firſt; and therefore was wiſely turned into a charge of *Socinianiſm*, and put into your hands, who could not be ſuſpected for *Antinomianiſm*.

Def. of the Report, p. 85.

But I am now ſo much *better acquainted with the matters in difference among you*; that I doubt not, from the Papers on both ſides, to make this matter clear to any unprejudiced perſons; which will give great light to the following Diſcourſe; and as you deſire, *lay open the Wound in order to a cure.* We

We are then to take notice, that about ſeven or eight years ſince Dr. *Criſp's Sermons* were thought fit to be reprinted with the addition of ſome new ones; and your ſelf confeſs (which is very material) *That you were deſired* among others, *to ſet your Name to the Atteſtation before it; but you* very honeſtly *refuſed it; becauſe you apprehended it would be taken for granted, at leaſt by the common people, that your name ſhould ſtand there as an Approval of all the Notions in that Book, and enſnare many to a cloſure with the Errors contained in it.* Which was a ſufficient Reaſon. But it ſeems others were more eaſie in the matter; for twelve venerable Names, in great Letters, appear in the beginning of it: (whom I forbear to mention.) It's true, that the words of the Atteſtation go no further than, *that the additional Sermons were faithfully tranſcribed by the Author's Son from his own Notes.* But what need ſuch an *Atteſtation* of twelve Reverend Perſons, that Mr. *Sam. Criſp* did not falſifie his Father's hand? Was there ever ſuch an *Atteſtation* given to a per-

perſon of any tolerable credit? What muſt the World think, if no more were intended, of the Veracity of that Gentleman? But it may be ſaid, *That ſome of theſe perſons afterwards cleared themſelves in another Teſtimonial to Mr.* Flavel's *Book againſt Antinomianiſm.*

I grant, that ſome of them being ſenſible of the Reproach they lay under by that *Atteſtation*, did endeavour to clear their Reputation, as to this matter in theſe Words, *That whereas ſome weak people had miſunderſtood that Certificate, as if they intended an Approbation of all that is contained in that Volume, they declare, they had no ſuch intention.* But you tell us, that you refuſed to joyn in that *Atteſtation*, becauſe it would be ſo underſtood. And ſo you muſt be under *the weak people*, who did ſo apprehend the deſign of it, or they who did not apprehend, that ſuch uſe would be made of it. But as you very well obſerve, *Defence of the Report*, p. 86. Theſe very perſons in that new Teſtimonial do affirm, *That the difference between Dr.* Criſp

and

and others ſeems to lie not ſo much in the things, which the one or the other of them believe, as about their order and reference to one another. But you truely anſwer, *That you look on the difference between the Orthodox and Dr.* Criſp *to be much greater than this ſort of palleating Preface will allow it to be. And that if there be any thing dangerous in Dr.* Criſp's *Writings, as you believe there is, the expreſſions there uſed, tend to enſnare poor people to believe them as ſound and true.* So that you can by no means think, that theſe perſons have acquitted themſelves from giving too much countenance to Dr. *Criſp*'s Opinions. And one of thoſe Subſcribers hath ſince ingenuouſly confeſſed, *That this Impreſſion of Dr.* Criſp's *Sermons awakened ſome of the more zealous among the united Brethren, to conſider of ſome proper expedient to obviate the growth of thoſe Errors.* Rebuke, p. 10.

And this was the occaſion of Mr. *D. Williams*'s publiſhing his Book called *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, wherein ſome of *Dr.* Criſp's *Opinions are conſidered*, &c. *A Book*, ſaith the ſame perſon,

perſon, *to ſay no more, ingeniouſly penned, exactly methodized, the Truths and Errors fairly ſtated, and for ought I can ſee, piouſly deſigned.* This Book came forth at firſt with the *Atteſtation* of ſeveral of his Brethren, not merely as *to the right ſtating of Truths and Errors, but as a conſiderable ſervice to the Church of Chriſt; and as a means for the reclaiming of thoſe who have been miſled into ſuch dangerous Opinions, and for the eſtabliſhing thoſe that waver in any of theſe Truths.* Which are the words of it.

Mr. *Williams* declares in the beginning of his Preface, *That he had been often ſolicited to this work by ſeveral of his Brethren; and that he was convinced, that the Revival of theſe Errors muſt make their Miniſtery uſeleſs, and Unity impoſſible.* This bears date, *May* 4. 1692.

But as the Author of the *Rebuke* expreſſes it, *p.* 15. upon the coming forth of this Book, *Such a ſtorm of Paſſion, ſuch Indignation againſt the Author and his Book broke out, as had almoſt overſet the united Brethren with their Union.* The firſt publick

Act,

Act, whereby any diſcovered their Reſentments, was a Paper delivered in to the *united Brethren*, *Oct.* 17. 1692. *Importing a high and heavy charge againſt the Author and his work, and ſubſcribed by ſix, three whereof never entred into the Union; and yet now joyned in accuſing him for breaking it*, p. 18. But it ſeems theſe *united Brethren* looked upon theſe Accuſations either as frivolous, or *ungrounded*; for ſay they, *They recited as Mr.* Williams's *Words, what they found quite contrary to the Letter of his expreſſions.* Upon this, one of the Subſcribers, a warm Advocate for Dr. *Criſp* (as he hath ſince abundantly diſcovered himſelf) declared in a meeting of the *united Brethren, That he would break off from their Union, becauſe they had taken no notice of the Paper of Objections againſt Mr.* Williams's *Book.* Anſwer to the *Report*, p. 3.

Which Paper is ſince printed by the ſame perſon; and to be ſure to have it ſeen, both at the beginning and end of one of his learned Treatiſes againſt Mr. *W.* but with ſome variety. But the only thing conſi- *Neonomian.* part 3. *p.* 1. *p.* 96.

derable in it, is, that among all the Exceptions then given in, there is not one word tending to the Charge of *Socinianiſm* againſt Mr. *W.* Can we imagine theſe zealous Brethren ſhould omit ſo material a charge, if they had ſuſpected it, or have been ignorant of it, if there had been ground for it? So that if it be a juſt charge, it is a great Reproach upon thoſe who delivered in their *Exceptions*, and wholly left it out. It is true, they very prudently reſerve to themſelves a liberty of bringing in farther *Exceptions* afterwards: but it is not conceivable, that they would have omitted this, if they had ſeen any ground for it; becauſe it would have made much more noiſe, as it hath done ſince, than any of thoſe *ungrounded Exceptions* (as the *united Brethren* called them) which they delivered in.

But it is further obſervable, that ſome conſiderable time after this, other ways being found unſucceſsfull, a perſon was appointed (whom I need not to name) to examine Mr. *Williams*

Williams Books, and to collect out of them what Errors he could discover. And accordingly a Paper was drawn up of *Objections* against Mr. *W.* which coming to Mr. *H*'s hand, he printed it, which occasioned a short Reply by Mr. *W.* And here the Charge of *Socinianism* began, which Mr. *W.* calls *slanderous* in his Answer to Mr. *H*'s Letter, *p.* 7. and makes this solemn Protestation; that he owned *Christ's eternal Generation as the Son of God, of one Essence with the Father; that he owned the Doctrine of Satisfaction by the Sufferings of Christ in our stead; and that his Sufferings were Punishments satisfactory to Divine Justice for our sins; that Christ was a proper Sacrifice, and himself the Priest that offered it upon earth; that his Obedience is properly meritorious of all our saving Benefits; and himself a proper* Ἀντίψυχος *in his Death.*

Now I appeal to your self, whether any person can in more proper and effectual terms clear himself from the charge of *Socinianism*, than he hath done in these words. I be-

derable in it, is, that among all the Exceptions then given in, there is not one word tending to the Charge of *Socinianiſm* againſt Mr. *W.* Can we imagine theſe zealous Brethren ſhould omit ſo material a charge, if they had ſuſpected it, or have been ignorant of it, if there had been ground for it? So that if it be a juſt charge, it is a great Reproach upon thoſe who delivered in their *Exceptions*, and wholly left it out. It is true, they very prudently reſerve to themſelves a liberty of bringing in farther *Exceptions* afterwards: but it is not conceivable, that they would have omitted this, if they had ſeen any ground for it; becauſe it would have made much more noiſe, as it hath done ſince, than any of thoſe *ungrounded Exceptions* (as the *united Brethren* called them) which they delivered in.

But it is further obſervable, that ſome conſiderable time after this, other ways being found unſucceſsfull, a perſon was appointed (whom I need not to name) to examine Mr. *Williams*

Williams Books, and to collect out of them what Errors he could discover. And accordingly a Paper was drawn up of *Objections* againſt Mr. *W.* which coming to Mr. *H*'s hand, he printed it, which occaſioned a ſhort Reply by Mr. *W.* And here the Charge of *Socinianiſm* began, which Mr. *W.* calls *ſlanderous* in his Anſwer to Mr. *H*'s Letter, *p.* 7. and makes this ſolemn Proteſtation; that he owned *Chriſt's eternal Generation as the Son of God, of one Eſſence with the Father; that he owned the Doctrine of Satisfaction by the Sufferings of Chriſt in our ſtead; and that his Sufferings were Puniſhments ſatisfactory to Divine Juſtice for our ſins; that Chriſt was a proper Sacrifice, and himſelf the Prieſt that offered it upon earth; that his Obedience is properly meritorious of all our ſaving Benefits; and himſelf a proper* Αντίψυχος *in his Death.*

Now I appeal to your ſelf, whether any perſon can in more proper and effectual terms clear himſelf from the charge of *Socinianiſm*, than he hath done in theſe words. I be-

lieve you to be no *Antinomian*, becauſe you have ſo expreſly declared your ſelf to be none; but not in words which can ſignifie it more, than theſe are againſt *Socinianiſm*: and why muſt I not in equal Juſtice and Charity believe him to be no *Socinian*? But if after all he may be a *Socinian* and not know it; why may not others as well ſay, you may be an *Antinomian*, and not know it? You may ſay, *That he uſes ſome Phraſes and Expreſſions as they do*; but doth he uſe them in their ſenſe? Its poſſible, I may think you may uſe ſome expreſſions, as the *Antinomians* do; muſt I therefore think you an *Antinomian* againſt your expreſs Declaration to the contrary? Why ſhould not the ſame meaſure of Juſtice and Charity be uſed to Mr. *W.* which you would think reaſonable in your own Caſe? But of this more at large hereafter. That which I now obſerve is, that this charge of *Socinianiſm* was ſo lately begun; although it hath been carried on with ſo much noiſe and earneſtneſs ſince. For in your *Letter* to Dr. *Bates*, in

An-

Anſwer to *Mr.* Williams *his ſhort Vindication*; you have theſe words. *Why did you make the intimation of* Socinianiſm *thus publick? Mr.* H. *carefully concealed that part from the World; and it was my Reſolution to have confined all Debates of it among our ſelves.* As to your inſtances, they muſt be conſidered in their due place; but you take no notice of his Proteſtation againſt *Socinianiſm:* which I think you ought to have done. Letter to Dr. *Bates*, p. 15. 1695.

The next thing fit to be obſerved as to this matter, is, that it appears by the Anſwer of the *united Brethren* to your Report, *p.* 3. that a number of the Brethren was appointed to conſider the Objections againſt Mr. *W*'s Book, who with the Objectors came to an Accommodation in that affair, by a Subſcription to certain Doctrinal Propoſitions, wherein no notice is at all taken of theſe Phraſes, which ſo much weight is now laid upon; and therein is contained, ſay they, *a promiſe to their utmoſt to avoid all appearance of oppoſition to one another*; and among thoſe Subſcribers your name appears,

p. 5. I hope, I may, upon this Appeal, ask you, whether at that time you knew of this charge of *Socinianiſm* to lie againſt Mr. *W.* or not? If you did not, yet you promiſed no *oppoſition* as long as perſons kept within the bounds of that agreement; if you did know it, the matter lies harder upon you. For you *to promiſe no oppoſition*, and yet think your ſelf at that time bound to oppoſe. But rather than charge you with this, I believe this about *Socinianiſm* to be a game ſtarted afterwards; upon a freſh Examination of his Books.

But in the mean time, what was done againſt the *Antinomian Errors?* For we are to conſider, that notwithſtanding the expedient, the Union was ſoon broken, as the *united Brethren* ſay, *and thoſe called congregational Brethren held a diſtinct and ſeparate meeting, the very day and hour of the Week of their Aſſembling as united Brethren.* To prevent a total breach, *in the latter end of* 1694, *a number was appointed to treat with the diſſenting Brethren in order to a Re-union:*

Anſwer to the *Report*, *p.* 6.

Re-union: and they pretended nothing for their Separation, *but that there were erroneous perſons in the Union.* But to give ſatisfaction, a new Paper of *Propoſitions* was drawn up, on the one ſide, againſt ſuch Errors as they ſuſpected, and on the other *againſt Criſpian and Antinomian Errors*; and they tell us, *That your ſelf, with three more were imployed in it; and that you were the perſon pitched upon to carry it to the diſſenting Brethren*, Jan. 7. 1694. But they tell us withal, *That this Paper was rejected by them and no Anſwer ſent them concerning it to that day.* P. 7. And the Author of the *Rebuke* ſaith, p. 27. *That no Satisfaction could be obtained, they were inflexible; and would not comply in any one of the ſeven Articles propoſed to them; and thus the breach became beyond the united Brethrens making up.* And he adds, *That ſome of the chief of the diſſenting Brethren did both from Preſs and Pulpit diſſeminate ſuch horrid Opinions as filled all intelligent Perſons with equal Aſtoniſhment and indignation:* P. 25. a number of which he there

ſets down, which are all *Antinomian* Doctrines. And the *united Brethren* in their Anſwer repeat the ſame, *p.* 22. and offer *to prove them from the Books of the aforeſaid Authors, and a great deal more, if not worſe of the ſame*

P. 25. *ſort*; *By theſe things*, ſay the *united Brethren, its manifeſt what the difference is about, though a noiſe hath been raiſed about things remote from the true occaſion, that while we ſeemed to be only on the defenſive part their Errors might receive Countenance, as if unoppoſed, and the Abettors thereof might leſs appear the cauſe of our Diviſions.*

Notwithſtanding all theſe Diſcouragements, they tell us, *That three Papers were drawn up in order to an Accommodation. The firſt Paper*, they

P. 13. ſay, *was concerted by one of their Brethren, with ſome of the Diſſenters; but it was unanimouſly agreed to be laid aſide, with a ſecond Paper, that had been brought to them by another Brother; but they appointed ſix of their Brethren to draw up a* Third Paper, *which they, after ſeveral days conſideration, unanimouſly agreed to ſend in*

a

a Letter to the diſſenting Brethren; which is extent in their *Anſwer to the Report*, p. 10. wherein they declare, *That they come as near to them as they could with Truth and Freedom from Ambiguity in points of ſo great concernment, and in a time, when ſo many are at work to propagate* Criſpianiſm *and* Antinomianiſm, *p.* 14. The event of theſe Papers, as they inform us, was, *That the diſſenting Brethren adhered to their own Paper, called the Firſt, and refuſed theirs, becauſe* (ſay they, p. 25.) *this doth provide ſome defence againſt ſome of the Errors which our difference is about.* And after all, *p.* 27. they make this offer, *That if the diſſenting Brethren will declare with them in renouncing thoſe* Antinomian *Errors there ſet down, they would ſubſcribe with them to ſuch a ſenſe of the doubted expreſſions, as might give them ſatisfaction; and to uſe their very Words and Phraſes explained in the Orthodox ſenſe. Which if they refuſe, it will then appear, that it was not any difference in the Doctrines pretended by the Report, which was* P. 29.

the

the reaſon why they did not unite; but that the differences are kept up from their Zeal for the forenamed Opinions of Dr. Criſp, *and the* Antinomians, *which they think to be very erroneous.*

Thus I have ſhewed with as clear and convincing Evidence as theſe Papers would afford, what was the true occaſion of the difference, and what it is which keeps it up.

I muſt not now paſs over what you have ſaid for the clearing the diſſenting Brethren from countenancing *Antinomianiſm.* And it is in your Obſervations on the firſt Paper, called *Remarks*, p. 9. where you ſay, that the publiſhing this Paper clears the *Congregational Brethren from Antinomianiſm.* It was very good ſervice to them if it be found ſo to do. But I think I have ſome reaſons to doubt it.

For, (1.) Why are not the *Antinomian* Errors, which you look on as dangerous, plainly and expreſly condemned in it? You knew very well, that they inſiſted upon this before, and your ſelf carried a Paper to

to that purpoſe; to which no manner of ſatisfaction was given; but inſtead of it, they went on preaching ſuch Opinions which they accounted horrid, ſcandalous and deſtructive to their Miniſtery. Either this Accuſation was true or not. If not, thoſe Brethren ought to have been required in common Juſtice to make good their charge, by a ſolemn Meeting on both ſides. But this was never called for; and therefore a ſuſpicion of guilt muſt remain on the Party accuſed, when they refuſe to make their defence before competent Judges, and upon fair notice of the matters they intended to proceed upon. This was ſufficiently intimated in the ſeven Propoſitions, *Jan.* 7. 1694, and more fully expreſſed in the Vote of the united Brethren, *Sept.* 15. 1695. Where they ſet down diſtinctly the Errors they had collected out of their Books, and offer'd to prove them by Book and Page, when it ſhould be called for. The Author of the *Rebuke* calls them *abominable Doctrines*, p. 25. and ſaith he will give *a little taſt of ſome few*

few of them; and cautions the Readers to implore the ſpecial Grace of God to fortifie themſelves with that Antidote, leaſt this little taſt ſhould prove their Bane and Poiſon. And this *little taſt* amounts to 21. Not one of which is renounced in this *firſt Paper*, which you ſay, *doth clear the Congregational Brethren from Antinomianiſm.* I do think they had great reaſon to inſiſt upon a plain and direct renouncing thoſe Errors, if they believed thoſe Accuſations true; and if they did not, they did very ill to publiſh them. For this muſt fill the world with ſuch Jealouſies of them, as they can never be cleared from, but either by their renouncing the Errors, or the others recouncing the Accuſation. And I am of Opinion, that neither the *firſt*, nor the *third Paper* can give any reaſonable Satisfaction as to this matter, without a renouncing the *Antinomian* Doctrines. For the Accuſation is now made publick; and the Nation is concerned as to the diſhonour done to Religion by them. But the united Brethren have

ſo

ſo much more reaſon to inſiſt ſtill upon it, becauſe in that which you call *the healing Paper*, (*Rep. p.* 14. *Remark, p.* 6.) Mr. *W.* is required *to give Satisfaction, not only as to the Doctrine of Juſtification, and change of Perſons*, &c. *but about any thing elſe, that any Brother excepts againſt in the reſt of his Writings.* Now this ſeems to me very hard and unequal meaſure, that the one muſt be required to give ſuch a ſatisfaction as is hardly poſſible to be given, to he knows not *whom*, nor in *what manner*; and on the other ſide, when the whole Body of the united Brethren deſire ſatisfaction in Doctrines of ſuch importance, none in effect is thought fit to be given them. This to me looks like a kind of Inequality and Superiority, which the *diſſenting Brethren* challenge over the *United:* I do not mean in a legal Juriſdiction, but in that which is worſe, which is Will and Pleaſure. And I think thoſe very *eaſie Brethren* who ſubmitted to the *firſt Paper*; which was after rejected at the Meeting of their Body: but it ſeems although

nine

nine of them did it in ſeveral manners; yet the *Diſſenting Brethren* gave a very cold and indifferent Approbation of it; not as a foundation of Re-union; but only, *that they are glad to find ſo good an agreement, as that Paper doth expreſs.* Which being penned in ſuch general terms, was juſt none at all; as will appear by the next Reaſon. Which is,

2. That there is no ſuch renouncing the *Antinomian* Errors in it, but thoſe who hold ſome of the groſſeſt of them may comply with them in it.

To make out this, I ſhall inſtance in ſome of thoſe which the united Brethren charge the others with preaching and publiſhing. As,

1. That Pardon is rather the condition of Faith, and much more having a cauſal influence thereunto, than Faith and Repentance are of Pardon.

2. That ſin it ſelf, as oppoſed to guilt, is laid upon Chriſt; and Chriſt was reputed a Criminal, not only by Man but by God.

3. That

3. That the Doctrine of Juſtification before Faith is not an Error, but a great and glorious Truth; and therefore we believe, that we may be juſtified declaratively.

4. Union with Chriſt is before Faith, at leaſt Nature, and we partake of the Spirit by Vertue of that Union, there is a compleat Union with Chriſt before the Act of Faith.

5. It's a great Truth that God ſees no ſin in a Believer; and ſin can do no real hurt to a Believer; God is not diſpleaſed with his People, and is not angry with the perſons of Believers for their ſins.

6. Believers are as righteous as Chriſt, not in a way of Similitude but Equality.

Theſe are the expreſs Words which are charged by the united Brethren, *Anſw. to the Reply, p.* 12, 13, 14. And I think the Fundamentals of *Antinomianiſm* are contained in them; let us now ſee how far theſe are cleared by *the firſt Paper.*

1. It is ſaid, *That Regeneration, Repentance towards God, Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and holy Converſation*

verſation are by God's expreſs word manifeſtly neceſſary to the Salvation of a Sinner, &c. But this doth by no means reach to the *Antinomian Doctrine*; which is not that theſe are not neceſſary to Salvation, as the Scripture hath declared God's purpoſe to work theſe things in thoſe he deſigns for Salvation; but that theſe are not made any *conditions* of the new Covenant on our part in order to our obtaining Juſtification and Salvation.

Dr. *Criſp* doth ſeem to exclude the neceſſity of our Obedience in order to Salvation, when he ſaith, *It is a received Conceit among many Perſons, that our Obedience is the way to Heaven*; —— *but I muſt tell you, that all this Sanctification of Life is not a jot the way of that juſtified Perſon to Heaven.* But we muſt take his whole ſenſe together. For he ſaith, however, *That Sanctification of Life is an inſeparable Companion with the Juſtification of a perſon by the free Grace of Chriſt.* And what is an inſeparable Concomitant in a perſon to be ſaved, is neceſſary by way of Con-

Criſp's Sermons, p. 46. laſt Edit.

Connexion to Salvation. He ſaith indeed, *that Salvation is not the end of any good work*; but he adds, *that there are other ends of good works; as the manifeſtation of our Obedience and Subjection, the ſetting forth of the praiſe of the glory of God's Grace; the doing good to others, to be profitable to men; which*, he ſaith, *are the ſpecial ends that Obedience is ordained for, Salvation being ſettled firm before.* Here we ſee, that Obedience and good Works are made neceſſary as *Concomitants to Salvation*, but not as neceſſary conditions in order to it, but for other ends, as Gratitude and Uſefulneſs to the World. In another place, he ſaith, *That without reſpect to good or evil, the Lord hath everlaſtingly eſtabliſhed all that ever he meant to do. And there are no intervening Acts or Carriages of yours that make any alteration at all in the Lord, at all to croſs what he hath written, to put in what he hath left out: the Lord doth nothing to his people upon conditions in his people, as if he did refer himſelf ſtill to thoſe conditions, and did ſuſpend what he* P. 152.

meant to do to his people, till he did perceive how they would carry themſelves to him. But what then, are they to do nothing? *Nothing that concerns the Peace, Comfort and Good of his People, that is already firmly eſtabliſhed; nothing with an eye to their own advantage, that being already perfectly compleated to their hands before they do any thing, but ſimply with an eye to glorifie God, and to ſerve their Generation.* And to the ſame purpoſe he ſpeaks in other places. In one of the additional Sermons he ſaith, *That God himſelf hath inſeparably joyned Salvation and a holy Life, and hath promiſed the one as well as the other.* So that Dr. *Criſp* himſelf could have ſubſcribed your third Paper in the words you have drawn up, *and have been glad*, as others were, *that you were ſo far agreed.*

P. 141, 183, 322. P. 35.

But wherein then lies the difference? Dr. *Criſp* utterly denies, that in the new Covenant there are any conditions on our part. *Mark what I ſay*, ſaith he, *I ſay the new Covenant is without any condition whatſoever*

P. 81, 186, 255, 433.

ever on man's part. And this he goes about to prove, and after ſaith, *that in way of condition of the Covenant ye muſt do nothing.* P. 83. But he objects conditions or no conditions ſomething muſt be done; *It is true,* ſaith he, *by way of conſequence, that after we are in Covenant with God, he will beſtow theſe things upon us as fruits and effects of that Covenant: but it is not true, by way of Antecedence, that God doth require theſe things at our hands before we ſhall be partakers of the Covenant.* P. 81. Again he objects, If all lies on God's part, and man muſt do nothing, then all his lifetime he may do what he liſt. He anſwers, *You muſt make a difference between doing any thing in reference to the Covenant, as the condition thereof; and in doing ſomething in reference to ſervice and duty to that God, who freely enters into Covenant with you. I ſay only that in way of condition of the Covenant you muſt do nothing.* But is there no obligation on man's part to perform ſome conditions as to the benefits of the Covenant? No; he ſaith expreſly,

P. 82. *That the whole performance of the Covenant, lies only upon God himſelf, and that there is not one Bond or Obligation on man to the fulfilling of the Covenant, or partaking in the benefits of the Covenant.* This ſeems to be ſtrange Doctrine; but he goes farther, and denies *even Faith it ſelf to be the condition of the Covenant.* He

P. 84. objects that it is ſaid, *that he that believes ſhall be ſaved, and he that believes not ſhall be damned.* But he anſwers, *that there is no perſon ſhall be ſaved, till he have believed. This I grant; yet this will not make Faith the condition of the Covenant. For then the Covenant would depend upon a work. For our act of believing is a work.* And in another place he

P. 153. ſaith, *that it is a bringing back a Covenant of works to believers, to ſay, that it ſhall fare well or ill with them, as they can obey, or as they do diſobey the Lord God.* Here we ſee that he makes conditions on our part to be no leſs than making void the Covenant of Graee, and ſetting up the Covenant of Works.

And

And is this part of Dr. *Criſp*'s Doctrine diſowned or renounced by thoſe who are called *diſſenting Brethren?* So far from it, that one of them hath ſet himſelf to defend it: and he lays down this Aſſertion, *That neither Faith, nor any other gracious qualifications are federal conditions or conditions of the Covenant of Grace.* And this man's name is among the Subſcribers of the *firſt Paper*, by which we may judge how it was underſtood by them. The force of all his Reaſons, ſuch as they are, is built on this Suppoſition, *That all federal conditions are meritorious, and make the reward of Debt and not of Grace; and then there is no difference between a Covenant of Works and of Grace.* From hence he ſaith, *that Chriſt is the ſole condition of the Covenant of Grace: and that it's impoſſible any thing elſe ſhould be the condition of it.*

Neonom. Part 3. p. 135.

P. 138.

But by *condition* he means *the foundation*; for faith he, *nothing elſe can reconcile us to God in bearing the ſin and curſe.* But this is far enough from being the true ſtate of

the queſtion; which doth not relate to the fundamental condition of the Covenant of Grace it ſelf; but to the manner of the Communication of the benefits of it to us. And one would think it were eaſie for men to conſider the difference between a condition of Purchaſe, and a condition of Poſſeſſion, the Purchaſe being paid. Will any man ſay, that there can be no condition of Poſſeſſion, but it muſt have the price of the Purchaſe in it? The ſole queſtion in this caſe, is not, whether by any conditions on our part, we can merit pardon of ſin or eternal life, or increaſe of Grace? For we utterly renounce all ſuch Doctrines as are repugnant to the deſign and grace of the Goſpel; but whether Chriſt, who alone hath purchaſed Redemption for us, hath not required ſome conditions on our parts to fit us for the Participation of the benefits of this Redemption? And the Covenant of Grace being founded in the Satisfaction of Chriſt, the conditions on our part can be no other than conditions *of Intereſt, Reception*,

on, or Participation of the ſaid Covenant. But even theſe are denied by Dr. *Criſp*: for he will not allow ſo much as fitneſs on our ſide; as appears by theſe remarkable words of his. *Chriſt looks not for fitneſs, but people may be capable of Communion with him without fitneſs; he takes them into Communion with himſelf, and afterwards fits them for ſuch Communion, as he would have them; but before-hand there is no fitneſs; ſuppoſe what fitneſs you will in expecting of the Grant, I ſay, in expecting the grant of Chriſt, fitneſs or not fitneſs is all one.* Serm. p. 208.

But do not all conditions ſuppoſe the reward to be of Debt upon the performance of them, and conſequently imply ſomething of *merit of Congruity*, although there be no *Condignity* in them?

I anſwer, that where there is any *true merit*, which makes the *reward of Debt*, there is, as St. *Paul* ſaith, a foundation of *Boaſting*; i. e. a right to challenge the reward as due on the account of the performance. But where only a *fitneſs* is required,

and that *fitneſs* depending upon divine aſſiſtance, and the reward infinitely beyond the Performance, there is not the leaſt colour for merit, or for any ground of Boaſting.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Myſtery of Antinomianiſm *laid open.*

BUT concerning this whole matter, it may be ſaid, *That as long as both Parties are agreed, that there is a neceſſary Connexion between Holineſs and Happineſs; and that there are relative conditions on our parts required, although not federal; all the reſt ſeems to be a diſpute about words, and ſo any reaſonable terms of Accommodation ought to be accepted.*

To which I anſwer, That if there had been no more in the Controverſie than what is contained in thoſe terms, it might have been fairly and eaſily accommodated; but I am of opinion, that there is a greater Myſtery in *Antinomianiſm* than this; which ought to be laid open to prevent the Miſchief of it. For all this Diſpute about conditions on our part depends upon another, and if that hold, this muſt follow

low as the consequence of it; and several other things which Dr. *Crisp* saw very well had a necessary Connexion with each other; and like a fair dealer in Controversie, owned them all.

I come therefore to the next thing in the *first Paper*, which you say, *clears the dissenting Brethren from the charge of* Antinomianism. Your words are, *That touching a change of Persons between Christ and Believers, there is no physical change, whereby Christ and Believers do in substance become one another; nor a moral change whereby Christ should become inherently sinfull, and Believers thereby become immediately innocent and sinless; but the change is only in a legal sense Christ, by consent between the Father and him, putting on the person, and coming into the room and stead of sinners.* Now I shall make it appear, that you have not herein disowned Dr. *Crisp's sense of the change of Persons*, from whence his other Doctrines follow.

Report, p. 13. Rem. p. 11.

To make this out, I shall prove, that Dr. *Crisp* did not assert such a change

change from whence it followed, *that Christ was inherently sinfull.*

In his first *Sermon*, p. 10. he hath these words, *In one word, beloved, mistake me not; I am far from thinking any Believer is freed from acts of Sin*, (i.e. from having been *an Actual Transgressor*) *but he is freed only from the charge of Sin. All his sins are charged upon Christ, he being sin for him; yet Christ is not an actual Sinner, but Christ is all the Sinners in the World by Imputation.* By *Imputation* he means a *real Transaction*, as will appear afterwards. Again, p. 267. *Beloved, mistake me not, I say not that ever Christ was or could be the Actor or Committer of any Transgression, for he never committed any sin himself. Not that he was the Actor of any Transgression:* And more fully, P. 283. *I say, here is a Real Act, God doth really pass over Sin upon him, still keeping this fast, that Christ acted no Sin; so that in respect of the Act not one Sin of the Believer is Christ's; but in respect of Transgression. In respect of Conveyance, in respect of passing Accounts from one Head to another,* P. 268.

ther, in reſpect of that there is a Reality of making of Chriſt to be Sin. So that when you deny Chriſt to have been *inherently ſinfull*, you ſay no more than Dr. *Criſp* himſelf hath done: for he could not be *inherently ſinfull*, unleſs he were an *actual ſinner.* But we muſt obſerve, that although he denies this, yet he affirms, *That Chriſt was as really the Tranſgreſſor, as the perſon that did commit the ſin; or as if himſelf had actually committed Tranſgreſſion.* Now I would fain know, why thoſe words, *inherently ſinfull* were put in, inſtead of being *as really a Tranſgreſſor*; unleſs it were to do Dr. *C.* and his Friends a kindneſs. For when in your Appeal you diſown the Principles of *Antinomianiſm*, p. 8. you ſay, *That you reject the opinion of thoſe who hold, That upon tranſferring the guilt of our ſins upon Chriſt, he is to be eſteemed the perſon that committed all the ſins of thoſe for whom he died; or that the turpitude and filth of our ſins was transferred upon him, which is a Notion equally falſe, blaſphemous and impoſſible.* This is

as

as much as can be expected, ſuppoſing that you mean, that he was neither the *actual Tranſgreſſor*, which Dr. *C. denies*, nor, that he had the perſonal Guilt of our ſins upon him; which Dr. *C.* did *aſſert*, and built his whole *Hypotheſis* upon it; as I ſhall now make it plain.

This ſeems to be a *great Myſtery*; but it is really the foundation of *Antinomianiſm*, viz. *That Chriſt had the perſonal guilt of our Tranſgreſſions charged upon him, and ſo he was as ſinfull as we; and that by his diſcharge of it the guilt of their ſins is removed from them; and ſo no longer chargeable upon them; and by their change of Perſon with Chriſt, they become as compleatly righteous as he.* Dr. *Criſp* himſelf calls it a *Myſtery*, and well he might. *Beloved*, ſaith he, *here is a ſtrange Myſtery; the world will not receive it, unleſs they receive this Principle we are now upon, namely, That the Iniquity it ſelf of his people is laid upon the Back of Chriſt.* P. 269. *By Iniquity it ſelf*, he ſaith, *he means the fault of the Tranſgreſſion it ſelf.* P. 270. *If thou haſt part in the Lord Chriſt, all*

theſe

theſe Tranſgreſſions of thine become actually the Tranſgreſſions of Chriſt; and ſo ceaſe to be thine, and thou ceaſeſt to be a Tranſgreſſor from that time they were laid upon Chriſt, to the laſt hour of thy Life. Ib. *So that now thou art not an Idolater,* &c. *Reckon what ſin ſoever you commit, when as you have part in Chriſt, you are all that Chriſt was, Chriſt is all that you were.* ——*Mark it well; Chriſt himſelf is not ſo compleatly righteous, but we are as righteous as he was; nor we ſo compleatly ſinfull, but Chriſt became, being made ſin, as compleatly ſinfull as we: nay more, the righteouſneſs that Chriſt hath with the Father, we are the ſame righteouſneſs, for we are made the righteouſneſs of God; that very ſinfulneſs that we were, Chriſt is made that very ſinfulneſs before God. So that here is a direct change, Chriſt takes our perſon and condition, and ſtands in our ſtead; we take Chriſt's perſon and condition, and ſtand in his ſtead.* Theſe are his own words, and contain in them the very foundation of *Antinomianiſm.*

But

But my buſineſs at preſent is about the transferring our very faults upon Chriſt, which he calls, *the guilt of the fact*, and not the mere *guilt of Puniſhment*. *Many men*, ſaith he, p. 266. *are ready to think, that the guilt (ſuch as they call guilt) and the puniſhment of ſin lay upon Chriſt indeed, but ſimply the very faults that men commit, that is, that the Tranſgreſſion it ſelf is become the Tranſgreſſion of Chriſt is ſomewhat harſh.* Yes indeed it is, and more than *ſomewhat*. But let us ſee how he proves it; and he undertakes to do it by *Scripture* and *Reaſon*. But the miſchief of it is, that in the one he argues like a *Papiſt*, and in the other like a *Socinian*.

Firſt, he ſaith, *he will endeavour to clear it by manifeſt Scripture, that ſimply, without any Equivocation, ſimply, I ſay, Iniquity it ſelf not in any figure, but plainly ſin it ſelf was laid upon Chriſt.*

Some have been ready to conceive, that Iniquity in the Text is ſpoken figuratively; Iniquity, that is the puniſhment of Iniquity was laid upon him.

Juſt

Juſt as *Proteſtants*, when they are told, *this is my body* is in the Text, ſay, it is to be figuratively underſtood. *But ſee*, ſaith he, *how carefull the Spirit of God is, to take away all ſuſpicion of figure in the Text; there is iniquity, Tranſgreſſion and Sin. And it is ſtrange, that all thoſe three expreſſions ſhould ſtill be underſtood of puniſhment, and not ſimply of ſin it ſelf without any figure.* Not one jot ſtranger, than that, *this is my body*, ſhould be figuratively underſtood, when the literal ſenſe is neither agreeable to Scripture nor Reaſon.

For the Objection about guilt, that the Lord lays the guilt and puniſhment, and not ſimply the ſin it ſelf for ought that I can ſee, ſaith he, *it is a ſimple Objection.* So do the Papiſts ſay, as to our Objections againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that they are *ſimple Objections* taken from carnal reaſon; but we ought to ſubmit to the plain Letter of Scripture.

But how is this *ſimple Objection* anſwer'd?

(1.) *That*

(1.) *That the Scripture doth not mention the guilt of ſin as diſtinct from ſin it ſelf, and Chriſt is never ſaid to bear the guilt of ſin, but to bear ſin.*

And is this a wiſe Anſwer to the *ſimple Objection?* When every one that is converſant in the Idiom of Scripture, knows that the ſame word is often uſed for the ſin and the puniſhment of it; and the beſt Interpreters cannot tell ſometimes which to render the original word by. Why then may not Chriſt be ſaid to bear our *Sins*, when he bears the *Puniſhment* of them? *But Puniſhment is not Guilt.* But it is ſuch a Conſequence of *Guilt*, that therefore one is often taken for the other. *But to ſay, that he had the Guilt laid upon him and not the ſin, is to contradict Scripture.* How can that be, if *the Puniſhment and the Sin* be of the ſame importance, when *Chriſt is ſaid to bear Sin? But the Puniſhment muſt then have relation to the Sin as in the ſame Perſon.*

To anſwer this diſtinctly and clearly, I ſay, that there are three ways *our Sins* may be ſaid to have a relation to Chriſt's Sufferings, as a *Puniſhment* for them.

(1.) As a mere *external impulſive cauſe*, which being conſidered alone, amounts to no more than an occaſional Cauſe; and gives no proper Reaſon for Puniſhment: and ſo far the *Socinians* will go.

(2.) As this *impulſive cauſe* becomes *meritorious* by the voluntary act of Chriſt's undertaking to ſatisfie Divine Juſtice for our Sins, by making himſelf a Sacrifice of Atonement for them. But ſtill they are conſidered *as our Sins*; and not as his own; any farther, than that by his conſent he took upon himſelf to bear that guilt which relates to Puniſhment; and ſo they come to be juſtly charged upon him.

(3.) As the *perſonal Guilt of our Sins* is ſaid by Dr. *Criſp*, to be tranſferred on Chriſt; *the fault of our*
P. 170. *Tranſgreſſions themſelves*, ſaith he, *is ſaid to be upon him: ſo that in reſpect of*

of the reality of being a Tranſgreſſor, Chriſt is as really the Tranſgreſſor, as the perſon that did commit the ſin was a Tranſgreſſor before Chriſt took the Tranſgreſſion upon him. P. 267. Theſe are his own words, and leaſt any ſhould miſtake him in a point of ſuch conſequence he repeats them; *And this act of God's laying them upon him makes Chriſt as really a Tranſgreſſor, as if he himſelf had actually committed Tranſgreſſion.* P. 281. And again, *Chriſt by this Tranſaction and laying on of ſin, doth now become or did become when they were laid, as really and truly the perſon that had all theſe ſins, as thoſe men who did commit them really and truly had them themſelves.* In another place, P. 358. *The Lord hath laid this iniquity upon him, he makes a real Tranſaction, Chriſt ſtands as very a ſinner in God's eyes, as the Reprobate, though not as the Actor of theſe Tranſgreſſions; yet as he was the Surety, the Debt became as really his, as it was the Principals before it became the Sureties.*

But do not theſe words explain the reſt, and that he doth not ſpeak of ſin as a phyſical act; for he denies Chriſt to have been an actual Tranſgreſſor; but only in a moral Senſe, that he did bear our Sins by Imputation?

To this I anſwer, (1.) That he utterly denies the ſenſe of *Imputation*, as it is oppoſed to a real Tranſaction; and ſaith, it ſuppoſes a miſtake in God to eſteem of things otherwiſe than really they are; and that there is not one paſſage of Scripture, which ſpeaks of imputing our ſins to Chriſt. But if the word be allowed, he ſaith, *it hath reference to the truth and reality of the thing; as* Lev. 17. 4. 1 Sam. 22. 15. Beſides, he ſaith, *That God hath no other thoughts of things than as they are, he himſelf doth either make or diſpoſe of things. So doth he eſteem and think of things, and conſequently of ſin. If he ſay, he doth lay or hath laid Iniquity upon Chriſt, and that he hath diſcharged the Believer from all Iniquity, certainly God doth ſuppoſe and eſteem things to be thus as he hath diſpoſed of them.* (2.) He

P. 280, 281, 286.

P. 281.

(2.) He doth aſſert ſuch a laying Iniquity upon Chriſt, from whence the immediate Diſcharge follows as to the actual Sinner, who hath any ſhare in him. So that the Tranſlation is ſuch as from that time no actual Tranſgreſſion lies upon him: and he ceaſes to be a Tranſgreſſor, and his ſins are no longer his but Chriſt's, as appears from his words. His meaning then, is, that there is ſuch a real Tranſlation of the guilt of ſin upon Chriſt, that no kind of guilt doth from thence forward remain as to the actual Tranſgreſſor. And ſo there can be no Remiſſion of Sins, nor Juſtification afterwards; no condition in order to Pardon; no charging Sin upon Believers; no true Faith but believing that their Sins are already forgiven, *&c.* And if theſe things do not ſubvert the whole Order and Deſign of the Goſpel, it is hard to contrive a Scheme of Doctrines which doth it, and yet retain the Profeſſion of it. But theſe are Dr. *Criſp*'s words in another place; *All the Weight, all the*

Burden, all the very Sin it ſelf is laid upon Chriſt, and that laying of it upon him is a full diſcharge and general releaſe and acquittance unto thee, that there is not any one ſin now to be charged upon thee. So that a full Diſcharge is the immediate conſequence of laying our ſins upon Chriſt.

P. 298.

(2.) He anſwers about *Guilt*, *That it is not an Obligation to Puniſhment, but that it Relates to the Fact; as when a Malefactor pleads Guilty or not Guilty; the meaning is, whether the Fact was done by him or not. And therefore to ſay the Guilt is laid upon Chriſt, but not the Sin, is to ſay the Sin is laid upon Chriſt, and Sin is not laid upon Chriſt, which is a contradiction.*

P. 272.

In anſwer to this, it will be neceſſary to clear this matter about *Guilt*; for a great deal depends upon it, both as to the *Antinomian* and *Socinian* Controverſies.

In every Act of Sin there is a two-fold *Guilt* to be conſidered.

1. *The*

1. *The Guilt of the Fact*, as it is a Tranſgreſſion of the Law.

2. *A Guilt conſequent upon the Fact*, by virtue of the Sanction of the Law. For although the Deſert of Puniſhment naturally follows the Fact; yet the Obligation to it comes not from the Sinners Act, but from the will of the Lawgiver; who by the Law binds the Sinner to Puniſhment: So that this ſort of Guilt depends upon the Law, as the other did upon the Fact.

Now it is of great conſequence for us to conſider, how far Guilt is ſeparable from the Act of Sin; and ſo whether it be poſſible for the Actual Guilt of the Fact to be transferred from the Tranſgreſſor; and if it be not, there is no more ground for Dr. *Cr*'s *Hypotheſis* than for *Tranſubſtantiation*. For both have the words of Scripture, as they ſuppoſe; and if one be no more poſſible than the other, we ſhall find as little reaſon to embrace one as the other.

As to the Act of Sin, theſe things are inſeparable from it.

1. The *Guilt of the Fact.* For he that hath been an Actual Tranſgreſſor, can never be made not to have been ſo: For what is paſt, can never be made by any power whatſoever not to have been: and ſo the guilt of the fact muſt remain upon the perſon that committed it. It may be ſaid, *That this holds only as to the phyſical act, and not as to the moral Obliquity of it.* But the committing of the fact with the moral circumſtances of it, was a *perſonal act*; and how then can one be tranſferred more than the other? Beſides, when the Obliquity of the fact lies in a mere Privation of that Rectitude, which ought to have been in it, how can that which is no real thing in it ſelf, be transferred to another?

P. 270. But Dr. *Criſp* ſaith, *A Believer ceaſeth to be a Tranſgreſſor from that time his ſins were laid upon Chriſt to the laſt hour of his life. So that now thou are not an Idolater*, &c. *thou art not a ſinfull perſon*, &c. It's poſſible for ſuch a one to ceaſe committing his

his ſin, or to have his ſins forgiven him; but how it is poſſible for a fact already paſt not to continue as a fact paſt, is a thing I cannot underſtand. But he ſtill conſiders Sins as Debts, that when they are once paid are no longer Debts. But there is a great difference between the guilt of a fact, and the contracting of a Debt; for a Debt conſiſting in a thing real, whoſe property may be alter'd and transferred from one to another, it is eaſie to apprehend how that may ceaſe by being paid; but in criminal matters nothing is capable of being transferred, but the puniſhment, which is a thing real; but the Obliquity and Guilt of the fact is a privative and perſonal thing.

2. *The deſert of Puniſhment*, which follows the actual Tranſgreſſion cannot be ſeparated from it. For let what Grace or Favour ſoever be ſhewed, the Deſert of Puniſhment remains ſtill; or elſe there would be no ſuch Grace and Favour, if that could be taken away. But this Deſert follows inherent Guilt; for no Sinner

Sinner can deſerve that one that was not a Sinner ſhould ſuffer for his faults: Nor can the Law or Act of any perſon transfer the Deſert of Puniſhment from him that was the Actual Tranſgreſſor.

3. *The Turpitude*, as to the Act of Sin, cannot be removed from it. For wherever the Act of Sin is, it muſt be diſpleaſing to God; but the Turpitude, as it affects the Perſon of the Sinner, muſt have another conſideration. For God may ſee cauſe to forgive the Sinner, and receive him into his Favour, although he ſtill continues to hate and abhor the Sin.

As to the *Guilt of Sin*, as it relates to the *Puniſhment*, theſe things are to be conſidered.

1. That although Divine Juſtice requires Satisfaction for Sin, yet it is not neceſſary that the Actual Tranſgreſſors ſhould undergo that Puniſhment which they have deſerved by their Sins. For, then there would be no room for Grace and Favour to them.

2. That

2. That it is consistent with the Justice and Wisdom of God to accept of a Mediator, to interpose between the Severity of the Law and the Punishment of Transgressors, upon terms agreeable to the Divine Wisdom and Mercy.

3. That such a Mediator, undertaking to make an Atonement for our Sins, by suffering in our place and stead, may truly and properly be said to undergo the Punishment of our Sins, and our Sins to be the *Meritorious Cause* of it. *But if Desert adhere to the Personal Guilt; how can our Sins be the Meritorious Cause of anothers Punishment?* I answer, that a *Meritorious Cause* may be considered two ways.

1. In the Natural Course of things; and so *Desert* follows the Fact; so that the Sinner always deserves to be punished; and no interposition by another person can take away this Original Desert of Punishment: For although our Sins be forgiven, yet we still deserve to suffer for them; which we should not do,

do, if *Deſert* in this ſenſe could be transferred.

2. As *Deſert* implies only a juſt reaſon of Puniſhment; and ſo there may be a *Meritorious Cauſe* in extraordinary Caſes, when the Legiſlator conſents that another ſhall undergo the Puniſhment, which others have deſerved. *Immeritò quenquam punire eſt injuſtè punire*; as I have elſewhere obſerved out of *Crellius*: And *Immerito* in the *Greek Gloſſes* is rendred Ἀλόγως, and *Merito* by Εἰκότως and Εὐλόγως, and in *Cicero*, *jure & merito* are moſt commonly joyned together.

Diſc. 1. of Satisfaction, p. 145.

Theſe things I only mention at preſent; and as occaſion offers, I ſhall diſcourſe more of them afterwards.

I now come to conſider Dr. *Cr*'s. Arguments from Reaſon, *that Chriſt muſt bear Iniquity it ſelf.*

(1.) *It had been otherwiſe the extremeſt Injuſtice in the World for God to wound and bruiſe him*, pag. 273. *For Vindictive Juſtice doth imply and ſignify ſome Fault committed. That God*

God therefore might be juſt in puniſhing Chriſt, and do no more upon Chriſt than what was deſerved; he muſt firſt have the Iniquity laid upon him, that is the merit of that bruiſing, that there might be upon him the deſert of that bruiſing he did ſuſtain, p. 274. And again, *p.* 283. *There muſt of neceſſity be a preſent Deſert upon a perſon, before the Judge can inflict any thing upon the perſon. A Fault muſt be found upon a man before he may be executed legally and juſtly. Therefore the Fault muſt be found really upon Chriſt himſelf, before there can be an Act of God's Juſtice in wounding Chriſt.*

This is juſt the *Socinian* way of arguing. Chriſt could not ſuffer the Puniſhment of our Sins, becauſe he was perfectly Innocent, and therefore could not deſerve to be puniſhed: but Puniſhment without Deſert is unjuſt. The *Antinomians* we ſee joyn with the *Socinians* in the main Principle, *That unleſs there be Perſonal Guilt, the Puniſhment of Chriſt would be unjuſt.* But then they give a won-

a wonderfull advantage to the *Socinians*; becauſe they put the main of the Cauſe upon an Iſſue which can never be defended: *viz.* that our Perſonal Guilt and the Deſert of Puniſhment was transferred upon Chriſt. For let any man conſider with himſelf, whether he can think it poſſible for thoſe Circumſtances of Fact to be transferred to another, which inſeparably follow and adhere to the perſon who committed the Fact. Suppoſe Dr. *Criſp*'s own Caſe; a Malefactor is accuſed of a Crime, to which he is to plead Guilty or not Guilty; ſuppoſe it be Murder, or Adultery, can he that really did commit the Fact ever truly plead that he did not commit it? It may be ſaid, *As to Men he could not, but as to God he might; becauſe Chriſt taking his Actual Tranſgreſſions upon him, the Sin is no longer his but Chriſt's.* So that as to the *juſt and righteous Judgment of Men*, he continues ſtill guilty of the Fact; but not as to *God's*. But if Mens Judgment be *true and righteous*, then he muſt

muſt remain really guilty; and if God always doth judge according to Right, he muſt be ſo in God's Judgment too; or elſe a man may be truly guilty before Men, and not guilty before God, as to the ſame Fact. I do not mean that a Man may not be juſtly found guilty before Men, whoſe Sins may be forgiven by the mercy of God. For that relates to the Guilt of Puniſhment, which God may remit as to his Tribunal, and yet the perſon may juſtly ſuffer by humane Laws: But if the Guilt of the Fact were taken away by God's Remiſſion, then there would be no Foundation left for the Laws of Men to proceed upon. But if it be granted, that God doth judge him Guilty of the Fact, then that Guilt muſt remain upon him; and ſo he cannot ceaſe to be an Actual Tranſgreſſor in that Fact which the Law doth juſtly charge upon him. And if the Guilt of the Fact ſtill remains upon him, then it cannot be transferred to another; for two diſtinct Perſons, who did not joyn in the

the Fact, cannot be guilty of the ſame Fact; eſpecially ſo as he that committed it ſhall be free, and he that did not ſhall be charged with it. Theſe things are ſo agreeable to the natural ſenſe of Mens Minds, that if they did allow themſelves the liberty of thinking, they could be in no doubt concerning them.

And as it is as to the Guilt of the Fact it ſelf, ſo it is as to the natural deſert of Puniſhment, which follows from it. No Man hath committed a Fault which the Law hath appointed a Puniſhment to, but he deſerves to be puniſhed for the violation of it. And although it be poſſible for him to be pardoned, yet the deſert of Puniſhment muſt ſtill remain upon him; becauſe that reſults from his actual violation of the Law, which cannot be unacted. But cannot this Deſert be transferred to another? no more, than the Fact it ſelf. And Puniſhment taken in its moſt ſtrict and proper ſenſe, muſt follow Perſonal Guilt, and that Deſert which ariſes from the Actual Tranſgreſſion.

But

But do we not by this means take away the proper Puniſhment of Chriſt for our Sins, and ſo overthrow the Doctrine of Satisfaction? By no means. For I take away nothing but the Puniſhment which follows *Perſonal Guilt*; and if this be not taken away, the *Antinomian* ſenſe muſt be allowed; and Chriſt muſt be charged with the *Actual Guilt* of our Sins. But if this be, as you confeſs, *Falſe, Blaſphemous and Impoſſible*, then another notion of Puniſhment muſt be pitched upon, which may agree to the Sufferings of Chriſt in our ſtead; and ſuch a one is that of the Suffering of Chriſt as our Mediator, by the Father's Appointment and his own Conſent, which takes off all Appearance of Injuſtice in it: ſince there is a concurrence of the will of the Supreme Legiſlator; the free conſent of him who had the only cauſe to complain, and all this done to promote the wiſeſt and beſt Deſign for the good of Mankind.

But before I proceed farther, it will be neceſſary here to take notice of an Expreſſion of yours in your *Appeal*, which may be of uſe afterwards. Your words are, page 55, *Miſtake me not, I don't believe, that the Perſonal Guilt of our Sins, or that their Filth and Turpitude were transferred upon Chriſt: Nothing more abhorred by me than ſuch abominable Blaſphemies.* By this one would think you were the fartheſt from the *Antinomian* Doctrine of any one. But then it follows; *However I am perſwaded—that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt voluntarily on the Father's Invitation, coming under the Sanction of the violated Law, was juſtly charged with the Guilt of our Sins, found Guilty, Condemned, Sentenced and Executed as ſuch, even by that God who laid on him the Iniquity of us all.* Now, if I do not miſunderſtand both Dr. *Criſp* and you, you ſay as much in Conſequence as he doth in theſe latter words, and therefore you cannot diſown the transferring our Perſonal Guilt upon

on Christ. For, I pray consider the force of Dr. *Crisp*'s Reasoning. *If the Fault be not found upon Christ he could not be justly punished:* And you say, *that he was justly charged with the Guilt of our Si* ., *and therefore was justly punished.* But what *Guilt* was this, which was thus charged upon Christ? *The Guilt of our Sins*, you say, *but not the Personal Guilt.* What Guilt was it then? Not the meer Punishment; for we are now enquiring what that Guilt was which made the Punishment just: and there must be a *Transferring of Guilt* before to make the Proceedings just. Now what Guilt could that be, but the *Personal Guilt of our Sins*, as Dr. *Crisp* Asserted, and you Denied? And this appears more by your following words, p. 56. *And seeing Christ's Sufferings were a Judicial Act of God, it could not be otherwise; for Justice condemns none to Punishment, but upon the account of Sin; and punisheth none, but under the notion of Criminals: if Jesus Christ had been only treated as*

if he had been a Criminal, and died not as a Criminal in foro Poli, *his Sufferings could not have been a proper Puniſhment flowing from that Punitive Juſtice which is natural to God.* And wherein is this different from what Dr. *Criſp* had ſaid? For if Chriſt were a *real Criminal in God's Eſteem and Judgment*, then he was an *Actual Tranſgreſſor*, and had the Guilt of our Faults upon him; for, he had none of his own. And what Guilt could make him to die as a Criminal *in foro Poli* (as you call it) but the *Guilt of our Facts*; with the *Deſert and Turpitude* which followed them? For nothing could make him ſuffer as a real Criminal but *Actual Guilt*; and having none of his own, ours muſt be transferred upon him, in your opinion; and yet *you deny that he had the Perſonal Guilt of our Sins.* How can you make theſe things to conſiſt? You muſt aſſign ſomething that is not *Perſonal Guilt* which can make a *Real Criminal*; which I think is very hard to do. We ſay, that Chriſt did

did really ſuffer on the Account of our Sins, and that Juſtice was ſatisfied by his Sufferings; and that he took upon him the Guilt of our Tranſgreſſions by undergoing the Puniſhment for them, as our Sacrifice of Atonement; and that this was a Real Puniſhment as to him, but made *Juſt* by the Father's Will and his own voluntary undertaking. But to ſay, that he ſuffered as a *Real Criminal, and was ſo puniſhed by God*, is I think impoſſible to be underſtood; unleſs Dr. *Criſp*'s ſenſe of the Tranſlation of *Perſonal Guilt* be allowed, which you profeſs to abhor as *Falſe and Blaſphemous*.

(2.) Dr. *Criſp*'s Second Reaſon is, *That without this Tranſlation of our Perſonal Guilt, no Advantage could come to us by Chriſt's Sufferings*, pag. 272. For what Reaſon? *Becauſe a Man ſuffers only for his own Fault, unleſs the Fault of another be laid upon him.* Here is no Queſtion, but our Iniquities were laid upon Chriſt, and that he ſuffered in our ſtead; but the Diſpute is, about the Man-

ner how they were laid upon him; whether our very Tranſgreſſions themſelves were ſo laid upon him? And how doth it appear that we can have no benefit by Chriſt's Sufferings, unleſs that were done which was impoſſible to be done? But he makes it good by a *Suretyſhip for Debt*; *For* (ſaith he) *the bare Impriſonment of another Man doth not releaſe the Debtor in Priſon, unleſs he be Surety for him.* Very true. So we ſay that Chriſt's Sufferings had not availed us, unleſs he had been our Mediator, and appeared in our ſtead. But how doth it appear, that we cannot receive the Benefits of Chriſt's Mediatorſhip, unleſs our Perſonal Guilt were transferred upon him? Are not the Divine Appointment, the Deſign of Chriſt, and the Promiſes of the Goſpel ſufficient for that purpoſe?

P. 274.

And this is his great Argument on all Occaſions, *That our Sins are Debts, and they are reckon'd to Chriſt as our Surety, and he hath fully diſcharged them, and therefore they cannot*

not juſtly be charged upon us. This runs through all Dr. *Criſp*'s Diſcourſes, and he manages it with all advantage to his Cauſe, and therefore muſt be more conſidered.

In his *firſt Sermon*, p. 8. he ſaith, *That although a Believer doth ſin, he is not to be reckon'd a Sinner; for his Sins are reckon'd to be taken away from him. A man borrows a hundred pound, ſome man will ſay doth not he owe this hundred pound ſeeing he borrowed it? I ſay no, in caſe another hath paid the hundred pound for him. A man doth ſin againſt God, God reckons not this Sin to be his, he reckons it Chriſt's, therefore he cannot reckon it his. If the Lord did lay the Iniquity of Men upon Chriſt, then how can he lay it upon their Perſons? Thou haſt ſinned, Chriſt takes it off; ſuppoſing I ſay, thou haſt receiv'd Chriſt. And as God doth reckon Sin to Chriſt, and charges Sin upon him, ſo if thou be of the ſame mind with God, thou muſt alſo reckon this Sin of thine upon Chriſt; his back hath born it, he hath carried it away.*

And p. 283. *When one man becomes a Debtor in another man's room legally and by consent, this Surety that doth become the Debtor, he is not barely ſuppoſed to be the Debtor, but by undertaking of it and having it really paſt upon him, he is as really and truly the Debtor, as he was that was the Principal before; I ſay, as truly and really the Debtor: ſo that there is an abſolute truth and reality of God's Act in paſſing over Sins upon Chriſt, and laying them upon Chriſt.*

Again, p. 289. *There is therefore a certain tranſacting of Sin upon Chriſt, ſo real that indeed the Believer, though an Actor of Tranſgreſſion, is as truly and abſolutely diſcharged of his Sins, as if he himſelf had not committed them; I ſay, ſo diſcharged as if he had not committed them. As a Debtor when a Surety hath taken the Debt upon him, and the Debtor receives an Acquittance and Diſcharge, he is as free of the Debt now, as if he had never run into that Debt; ſo I ſay it is with a Believer, Chriſt being made a Surety of a better Teſtament, and thereby*

thereby becoming truly and really the Debtor inſtead of Believers, he ſo bears all the Debt himſelf, that they are altogether releaſed, and diſcharged, and freed, as if they had never been in Debt.

I need not to produce any more places to this purpoſe; although it were eaſie to do it; for, in this *Similitude* lies the main ſtrength and ſupport of his Cauſe.

But to ſhew how little force there is in it, we need only theſe Conſiderations.

(1.) That there is no ſufficient Foundation in Scripture, for our Sins being thus transferred to Chriſt as our Debts, and his undertaking as our Surety to pay them. If one reads Dr. *Criſp*'s Sermons, one would conclude, that there is nothing plainer, nor more frequently inculcated in Scripture than this: For he ſeems to lay the Foundation of all upon it, as though there were no other true way of underſtanding the Doctrine of *Chriſt's Satisfaction* but by it. The Title of one of his *Sermons*,

mons, Vol. ii. Serm. 3. is, *Chriſt the great Paymaſter of all the Debts of his People*: and he grounds it on that Text, *Iſa.* 53. *v.* 6. *The Lord hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all. Now*, ſaith he, p. 263. *as in Suretiſhip, our Debt becoming our Surety's, the Execution goes juſtly out againſt him; and ſo God can give a juſt Account of wounding him*, &c. Here it is taken for granted, *that Chriſt is made Surety for all our Sins as Debts*; without the leaſt ground in the Text for it; which wholly relates to Puniſhment. For the words properly ſignify, *That he made our Iniquities to meet, or to fall upon him*; as a Man falls upon his Enemy when he meets him. So the *Jewiſh* Interpreters underſtand the word; and to the ſame purpoſe *Symmachus* renders it; the LXX. *God gave him up to our Sins*; which *Procopius* expreſſes by ὥσπερ ἀντίψυχον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, *as one that ſuffered in our ſtead. S. Jerom. Tradidit eum pro peccatis noſtris*; or as he tranſlates the LXX. *Dominus tradidit eum propter iniquitates noſtras.*

ſtras. Here is nothing like *Chriſt's Suretiſhip to pay our Debts for us*; and yet, as if it had been the neceſſary ſenſe of the words, a great many Doctrines and Inferences are drawn from it; as of wonderfull Conſequence for right underſtanding what Chriſt hath done for us. God forbid that we ſhould go about to leſſen any thing of the Deſign of Chriſt's ſuffering for us, on which our Salvation ſo much depends. But the preſent Queſtion only relates to the Manner of his doing it, whether as a Surety for our Debts or no. Some will ſay, *What harm is there in this, ſince it is an eaſie Similitude, which People may apprehend without Trouble?* But it may be not without great Danger; for they can as eaſiely draw Conſequences from it too; "As that "Chriſt hath then fully diſcharged "our Debts already; and they can "no more be charged upon us, than "a Creditor can demand a Summ of "Money from a Debtor, which "was fully paid to a Farthing by his "Surety; and therefore all that we "have

" have to do is to believe, and to " be thankfull; for all this Tranſ- " action was long ſince paſt without " the conſideration of any Act on " our parts; and they muſt be great " Enemies to the Privileges of Be- " lievers, that can now talk of Con- " ditions on our Parts; for this is no " leſs than bringing us back to a Co- " venant of Works, and making " void the Covenant of Grace. Theſe are Conſequences of a very high nature, and have no Foundation but this Suppoſition, *That all our Sins as Debts are transferred upon Chriſt as our Surety; and he hath actually diſcharged the whole Debt, which therefore cannot lie upon thoſe whom he ſuffered for:* and conſequently we cannot ſuffer for thoſe Sins, which are already diſcharged; nor do any thing in order to our Juſtification and Salvation; whatever the Scripture ſeems to expreſs to the contrary. *But ſurely Men cannot build their Faith on ſuch Suppoſitions, unleſs they had other places of Scripture beſides this for their Foundation.*

Dr.

Dr. *Criſp* looked as far into this matter, as any one ſince, and it may be more, he turned the Scriptures over and over, and examined them with great care to find out what ſerved his purpoſe; for his Heart ſeemed to be ſet upon it, and as his Son ſaith, it ran in his Head when he was dying; and ſpeaking of thoſe who diſputed againſt his Notions of Free Grace, he ſaid, *Where are they? I am now ready to anſwer them all.* Which ſhewed the earneſtneſs of his Zeal about them. But there is but one place of Scripture which he could find, that ſeem'd to favour his Senſe, and that is, *Heb.* 7. 22. where Chriſt is ſaid, to be *the Surety of a better Teſtament.* *God*, ſaith he, *takes Chriſt for a Surety, as Men will do, ſo doth God with Chriſt.* —— *Man is a broken Debtor, and Chriſt is a Surety; one that is rich and able to pay, and therefore God will look after none but him; for this cauſe Chriſt gives his own ſingle Bond, and God is content to take Chriſt's ſingle Bond, and looks for no other Pay-maſter but Chriſt.* P. 217.

What

What ſtrange Deductions are here made from one word, quite beſides the Intention and Scope of the Apoſtle? who doth not ſpeak of *a Surety for Debt*, but of *the Surety* of a Covenant; not of one that was to pay our Debts to God; but of ſuch a Surety as was to give us Satisfaction by his unchangeable Prieſt-hood of the Performance of thoſe Promiſes which God made to us in this *better Covenant*. But of this more afterwards.

I now only take notice, that ſome of the Diſſenting Brethren I find charged *with talking much of a Suretiſhip, Righteouſneſs, and of an Equality of Believers with Chriſt as to it:* Which is another ſtrange Conſequence from *Chriſt's being our Surety as to the payment of our Debts, becauſe the Debtor may be ſaid to pay that Summ which the Surety lays down for him: and that God doth account that Believers have paid that Debt of Obedience which Chriſt hath paid in their ſtead; becauſe they are one legal perſon with Chriſt.* All this depends upon

upon this miſtaken Notion of *Suretyſhip*: but if it be once ſuppoſed, that we perfectly obeyed the Law in Chriſt, there can be no room for Remiſſion of Sins: For how can Sins be forgiven to thoſe who have perfectly obey'd the Law? Or how can they be ſaid to obey the Law perfectly in Chriſt, whoſe Sins being laid upon Chriſt, do ſhew that they have not obey'd it? For can they be ſaid to pay for their Diſobedience and to give perfect Obedience at the ſame time.

That the Argument doth not hold, that becauſe a Debt may be transferred to a Surety; and the Debtor be diſcharged on the Sureties undertaking the Debt, that therefore our Sins may be transferred to Chriſt, and we receive a Diſcharge by his becoming our Surety.

For (1) there is no difficulty in conceiving the transferring of Debts and diſcharge of a Debtor by a Surety. But in Sins the Guilt cannot be transferred as Money may; for the Guilt of the Fact remains a perſonal

perſonal thing; and although the Sinner be ſaid to owe a Debt to the Law; yet that Debt lies in the Obligation to Puniſhment, which he is liable to by the Guilt of the Fact; but although the Puniſhment may be transferred by the Legiſlatours conſent, yet the perſonal fault cannot. *But doth not this Debt ariſe from the Guilt of the Fact; how then can any diſcharge the Debt without taking the Fault?* I anſwer, That taking the Fault can ſignify no more than being anſwerable to the Law for it; which muſt reſpect the Debt of Puniſhment, which the Law inflicts; and he that takes away the Guilt of Puniſhment doth ſatisfy the Juſtice of the Law.

But we are told, *That nothing is a Demerit of Puniſhment but* Reatus Culpæ, *and therefore if Chriſt did undergo the Puniſhment of our Sins, he muſt bear the Guilt of our Sins as to the Fault.*

In the *Guilt as to the Fault* there are two diſtinct Conſiderations, 1. *The Fault it ſelf,* or the Actual Violation of

of the Law by him that committed it; and this can never be transferred. 2. *Of the Debt to the Law* which follows the Fact, and this reſpects the Puniſhment, which may be transferred.

How can this be, unleſs he be made liable to the Puniſhment, and that is only by the Fault?

Being *made liable* doth naturally and in ordinary courſe follow the Guilt of the Fact; but Laws and Puniſhments being made for wiſe Ends, the Legiſlator himſelf may interpoſe, and for great and wiſe Ends may change the ordinary courſe of Juſtice and accept of another Perſon to ſuffer inſtead of the Offenders, (as I obſerved before.)

2. But ſuppoſe the Fault could be transferred as *a Debt* may, how doth it follow, that upon this Tranſlation there muſt be *a preſent Diſcharge*, as there is upon a Sureties being accepted inſtead of the Debtor? For in the caſe of a Debt there is nothing looked after but payment of the Money; but in the Remiſſi-

on of Sins, there are very weighty Conſiderations, as to the manner of diſcharging the Obligation to Puniſhment. For the true Honour of God, and Religion, and the real Intereſt of Mens Souls as to the *working out their own Salvation* are deeply concerned in this matter. It is very poſſible for Men to frame a Scheme of Religion to themſelves from ſome peculiar Phraſes of Scripture, and general Promiſes, which may be fitted to ſome particular uſes as to give ſatisfaction to ſome Perſons Doubts (which ſeemed to be Dr. *Criſp*'s Intention) but upon Conſideration of the whole Deſign of the Goſpel, they may be of dangerous Conſequence to Mankind: who are too apt to make ill uſe of ſuch Principles, by drawing ſuch Deductions from them, which tend to incourage them in the neglect or careleſs performance of that ſtrict Obedience which they owe to God with reſpect to himſelf, and to their Neighbours. And it is of little moment to them to be told, *That God will*

will carry on his own Work of Grace in those whom he intends to bring to Salvation: For this naturally dispoſes Mens Minds to a paſſive careleſs temper, as though they had nothing to do, but to wait for Supplies from above; and to depend upon *God's working in them to will and to do of his good pleaſure*, without ſetting themſelves *to work out their own Salvation with fear and trembling*. And yet S. *Paul*, who certainly underſtood the Power and Deſign of God's Free Grace uſes one as the ſtrongeſt Argument for the other. What would he have ſaid to ſuch Men, who according to theſe Principles muſt have told him, That he diſcharged the freeneſs of God's Grace, by putting Men upon *working out their own Salvation*; *for this was to bring in a Covenant of Works again*; *and a Bargain and Sale with God*; *and to ſet up the Merit of Man's Works to Salvation*; *for every Condition gives a Right, and what gives Right may be challenged as due, and what may be challenged as due is meritorious.* Phil. 2. 12, 13.

If there be any thing in ſuch kind of Arguments S. *Paul* was as much concerned to have anſwered them, as any now-a-days; but he thought a great deal lay upon Mankind to do, notwithſtanding that wonderful Grace of God in the manner of our
Rom. 2. 7. Salvation by *J. Chriſt:* and that *by patient continuance in well-doing men ought to ſeek for glory, and honour, and immortality*; which they could not do unleſs they had a regard to it in *the ſeeking of it*, as the way to attain
1 Cor. 9. 24. it. Doth not he bid Chriſtians *ſo run that they might obtain?* Doth not this make *running a Condition of obtaining?* And what is *obtaining but Salvation?* What doth he mean by his
Phil. 3. 14. *preſſing toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Chriſt Jeſus?* Do not theſe Expreſſions imply a great care to obtain the Reward of another Life? Here is ſomething beyond meer *Gratitude and Service*; for he doth ſuppoſe a *Connection in way of Duty, and Means* in order to *the End*; and not meer *Connection in a way of Event*; *ſo that*

to

to thoſe to whom God will give Glory he will give Grace to fit Perſons for it. But S. *Paul* intimates far more when he ſaith, *That he kept his Body in ſubjection*; for what reaſon? was it meerly to teſtify his *Thankfulneſs*? He gives another account of it; *leſt* 1 Cor. 9. *that by any means, while I preach to* 29. *others, I my ſelf become a caſt-a-way.* Was S. *Paul* ſo ignorant of *the ſureneſs of the Goſpel Covenant*, as to ſuppoſe that by any Act of his he could make void that *Covenant* which hath no relation to *Conditions* on our part? Either he was ſo ignorant, or others muſt be extreamly miſtaken, who can hardly allow him to ſpeak tolerable ſenſe about this matter, if he doth exclude Conditions on our part in order to Salvation: But as no Man magnifies the Riches and Freeneſs of Grace more than he, ſo no one preſſes the Neceſſity of *Holineſs* more, as that, *without which no Man* Heb. 12. *ſhall ſee the Lord.* Is this only to 14. tell them, *That God will make them holy, if he deſigns to make them happy?* No, but he puts them upon

purſuing after Holineſs, for that Reaſon. Rom. 8 13. *For if ye live after the Fleſh ye ſhall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the Body ye ſhall live.* Is not this *acting for Life, and not meerly from it?* He ſuppoſes *the Spirit* ready to aſſiſt them in doing their Duty and the greateſt incouragement to the performance of it. And in general, he perſwades Chriſtians to great Sincerity in doing their Duties from this Conſideration; Col. 3. 23. *Knowing that of the Lord ye ſhall receive the Reward of the Inheritance, for ye ſerve the Lord Chriſt.* 24. *But he that doth wrong ſhall receive for the wrong that he hath done; and* 25. *there is no reſpect of perſons.* Could any Man more plainly inforce Men's doing their Duties with reſpect to Rewards and Puniſhments, according to the Performance of them, than S. *Paul* here doth? And that from this Conſideration *that there is no reſpect of Perſons:* which in this place muſt imply, that God will have a regard to Men's Actions and not to their Privileges.

Some

Some may perhaps ſay, *What is this, but to make the Promiſe to ſecure Life upon doing our Duties? And if this be not to make the Goſpel a more overgrown and ſwinging Covenant of Works, than ever the old Law was, they have loſt all their Theological Meaſures.* I know not from whence ſuch men take their *Theological Meaſures*; nor of what kind they are; nor by what Standard they are to be tried; but I know of no Infallible Standard but the Holy Scriptures; and therefore all *Theological Meaſures* are to be examin'd by them. And I think S. *Paul* may as little be ſuſpected for ſetting up a Covenant of Works as any Penman of the New Teſtament; and it is from him I have choſen to produce my Teſtimonies, becauſe it is he that attributes ſo much to the *Grace of God* in order to our Salvation. It is he that hath ſaid, *That God hath called us with an holy calling, not according to our Works, but according to his own Purpoſe and Grace which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus before the world began.* Neonom. Part 3. p. 286. 2 Tim. 1. 9.

Tit. 3. 5. It is he that hath ſaid, *Not by Works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his Mercy he ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration and* 6. *Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt; which he ſhed on us abundantly through Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour.* That requires men *to work out their Salvation with fear and trembling.* St. *Paul* uſeth the ſame word, *Rom.* 7. 18. where it ſignifies bringing a thing to effect, and is oppoſed to meer *willing*, and we render it *to perform*; in the LXX it is uſed for finiſhing and carrying on a thing already begun; and can imply no leſs than great Diligence in doing all ſuch things as tend to our Salvation; for that is the thing we are to work out by Divine Aſſiſtance; and therefore our own Working is required by the Author of our Salvation: Although he ſaves us not for the ſake of any Works of Righteouſneſs which we can do; yet his way of ſaving us is by *working out our own Salvation.* But we are told no more is meant by this, but *a continual maintaining a holy*

Neon. Part 3. p. 286.

Jealouſie

Jealouſie of our ſelves, leſt we ſhould fail of the Grace of God by truſting in our ſelves; for it's immediately added, For it's God that worketh in you both to will and to do. And is this all that St. *Paul* means? By *Fear* and *Trembling* indeed he underſtands great Humility of Mind, which carries along with it a Jealouſie of our ſelves; but what is *working out our Salvation?* That is *not truſting in our ſelves*, but depending on God to do it for us. But is there nothing then we are to do with that Divine Aſſiſtance promiſed? Are we to ſit ſtill, and only expect when *God will work in us to will and to do?* Then working out our own Salvation are inſignificant words, and imply doing nothing; which is ſuch a ſenſe of the words as was never thought on before; and will not be again by any that do think what they write.

But S. *Paul* gives another ſenſe when he perſwades Rich Men that *they do good, that they be rich in good works— laying up in ſtore for themſelves a good foundation againſt the* 1 Tim. 6. 18. 19.

time

time to come, that they may take hold of Eternal Life. How is this? what? 19. *Do good works that they may take hold of Eternal Life?* What is this but a *ſwinging Covenant of Works* of St. *Paul*'s ſetting up? What is become now of the *Theological Meaſures?* Had St. *Paul* forgot himſelf? Or did he, *who became all things to all men*, here deal with *Rich Men* in their own method, by way of *Bargain and Sale?* But ſurely he would never accommodate himſelf to their way of dealing, ſo as to overthrow the Covenant of Grace; as theſe men imagin ſuch Conditions would do it. And he very well underſtood the difference between the *Foundation* of the Covenant it ſelf, which was certainly nothing but *the Grace and Mercy of God through Jeſus Chriſt*; and the foundation of our hopes as to our obtaining the Benefits of it, which ſuppoſes the Performance of ſuch Conditions as are required from us; not as *Works Meritorious of a Reward*, but as *Means* which God hath appointed in order

to

to an *End*. As a Son that hath an Eſtate promiſed him of the free Gift of his Father; but yet he requires ſome Conditions to be performed by him before he comes to the Poſſeſſion of it; can any one think this *a Bargain and Sale* between Father and Son? or that he is to purchaſe the Eſtate by theſe Conditions? If theſe be their *Theological Meaſures* they had need to ſeek for new ones, for theſe will never hold according to the Standard of Scripture or Reaſon.

Which will yet more appear by what our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf hath ſaid concerning this matter; and ſurely we may moſt ſafely take *our Theological Meaſures* from him: For he knew beſt, how far and in what ſenſe the Guilt of our Sins was transferred upon him; and whether there followed an immediate Diſcharge upon it, without any regard to Conditions on our part. He had the Queſtion of the higheſt importance in this matter twice put to him; *What ſhall I do to inherit Eternal* Luke 10. 25

nal Life? At one time it was to try him, by a Captious Perſon; and after his repeating the two great Commandments of the Law of God and our Neighbour, our Saviour
28. ſaid to him, *Thou haſt anſwered well, this do and thou ſhalt live.* Had our Bleſſed Saviour only a mind to banter him? or was it to convince him of the Impoſſibility of his doing what was neceſſary for Eternal Life? It is not improbable that he intended to convince him of his Folly, who ſuppoſed he had kept theſe Commandments in the Jewiſh ſenſe of them; which he doth in a ſerious manner by the Parable of the *Samaritan*. But what can be ſaid to the other Caſe, where a young Man of Quality and Eſtate came to him, with the ſame Queſtion, but with a different Intention; for to ſhew he
Mark 10. 17. was in earneſt, S. *Mark* obſerves, *that he kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Maſter, what ſhall I do that I may inherit Eternal Life?* and when he anſwered well, it is ſaid,
21. *That Jeſus loved him:* which ſhews his

his Sincerity ſo far: but there was an immoderate love to the World in his Heart which he was not aware of, till our Saviour put him upon a ſevere Tryal of himſelf; *Go thy way, ſell whatever thou haſt and give to the poor.* And what then? *And thou ſhalt have Treaſure in Heaven.* Doth Chriſt himſelf make it a matter of *Bargain and Sale* for Heaven? Doth the Surety of the better Covenant eſtabliſh a Covenant of Works? And that when one came to him for direction to attain Eternal Life? Yet the three Evangeliſts who report this Story differ not as to this particular. But what was our Saviour's Deſign in it? Not barely to convince him, that he had greater and more prevailing Paſſions within him, than he was aware of; but that there was ſuch a uſe to be made of the things of this World, that they may be ſerviceable to another. And ſo he ſaith in another place, *Make to your ſelves Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteonſneſs, that when ye do fail they may receive*

Matt. 19. 21. Luke 18. 18.

Luk. 16. 9.

receive you into everlaſting habitations. Not by way of Merit; or any fooliſh Imagination of that ſort; but in Obedience to the Will of Chriſt, who hath made it ſo neceſſary a duty for thoſe who hope to be happy in another World to do good in this: which is evidently declared, by the Account which himſelf gives of the proceedings of the great Day. Which are far more to be regarded than mens *Theological Meaſures.* According to which I confeſs I know not what to make of the main Scope and Deſign of our Saviour's Preaching. For he was ſtill preſſing Men *to do the Will of the Father, to keep his Sayings, to obey his Commandments,* and upbraided Men for not doing it; and yet according to theſe *Meaſures* he knew it was impoſſible for them to do it; and that Mens *Salvation* was determin'd without any Regard to *Conditions* on our parts.

Matt. 25. 34.

If theſe be the right *Theological Meaſures*, what doth our Saviour mean when he bids Men *ſtrive to enter*

Luke 13. 24.

ter in at the ſtrait Gate; for many ſhall ſeek to enter in, and ſhall not be able: By which, it ſeems that bare *ſeeking* by faint and weak Endeavours is not ſufficient; but *by ſtriving* we may *enter*; or elſe it is to no purpoſe to put Men upon it. What can this mean, if our Endeavours are not made *Conditions*; for as he ſaith elſewhere, *Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto Life, and few there be that find it.* To what purpoſe is this ſpoken, but to ſtir Men up to greater care and endeavour to attain to Eternal Life; ſince ſo many do miſs of it, for want of diligence in the enquiry and purſuit after it? Mat. 7. 14.

But Dr. *Criſp*, by his new *Theological Meaſures*, hath found out an extraordinary ſenſe of theſe words; *viz. That they are not to be underſtood of ſtrictneſs of Converſation; but that it hath not that latitude that generally Men think it hath; for they think, that beſides Chriſt, there is ſomething in the way that leadeth to Life, and that is a Man's own Righteouſneſs;* Serm. p. 56.

teouſneſs; but if a Man's own Righteouſneſs be taken in, then it is a broader Way than Chriſt allows. But how could it enter into any Man's Head that reads our Saviour's words to the end of the Chapter, to think this could be his meaning? *v.* 21. *Not every one that ſaith unto me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in Heaven:* and *v.* 24. *Whoſoever heareth theſe Sayings of mine and doth them, I will liken him unto a wiſe Man,* &c. What can be more evident, than that our Saviour here ſpeaks of Obedience to his Will, as that *ſtrait Gate and narrow Way which leadeth unto Life?* So that if Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught true Doctrine (as no doubt they did) it was not meer transferring our Sins to Chriſt that is ſufficient for our Diſcharge and Salvation; but the Conditions of Faith, Repentance, and Sincere Obedience are required on our parts.

(3.) If there be no Conditions on our parts in order to the partaking the

the Benefit of Chriſt's Sufferings in our ſtead, how can Men have any good ground to ſatisfy themſelves, that the Guilt of their Sins is tranſferred upon Chriſt? This was a Difficulty which Dr. *Criſp* was aware of; and therefore labours much for the clearing of it. The ſhort of it is, If Men can believe it to be ſo, that is the beſt Evidence that the thing is really ſo. Theſe are his words, *If thou believe with all thy Heart, thy Sins are forgiven thee; (though the very believing it ſelf do not inſeoff thee in that freedom;) but if you would know whether you have any part in this Freedom or not, the believing in the Lord Chriſt is a ſufficient manifeſtation.* Again, *If the Lord hath laid Iniquity, and our Iniquity upon Chriſt, then whoſoever thou art to whom the Lord will be pleaſed to give the believing of this truth, that the Lord hath laid thy Iniquity upon him; that laying thy Iniquity upon him is an abſolute and full diſcharge to thee, that there neither is, nor can be any Iniquity, that for the preſent or for hereafter, can be* P. 128. P. 195.

laid to thy charge, let the Perſon be who he will: If the Lord, I ſay again, give to any to believe this truth, that it is his Iniquity the Lord hath laid upon Chriſt, God himſelf cannot charge any one Sin upon that Perſon.

Theſe are very bold Expreſſions, and ought to have had plain Scripture, or evident Reaſon to ſupport them, but they have neither. The place of Scripture he brings is, *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?* But is believing that our Sins are forgiven an infallible mark of God's Elect? Is it not poſſible for one not Elect to believe it, or for one Elect not to believe it? If ſo, how can it be any Reaſonable Argument to conclude, That a Man's Sins are forgiven becauſe he believes that they are? Is Preſumption a thing poſſible or not? If it be poſſible, is it not the greateſt Preſumption to believe without Grounds? And what Ground can any one have to believe that his Sins are forgiven becauſe he believes it? where hath God declared this in Scripture? and what

what ground can there be for true Faith without Divine Revelation?

But Dr. *Crisp* was aware of the Objection about Presumption, and he gives this Answer to it; *Let the Person be what he will be, if there be but a real receiving of Christ, there is not Presumption but true believing:* P. 493. Which is not at all to the purpose; for the Question is not about *Receiving of Christ* as to his Word and Promises; which is, no doubt, a real Act of Faith; nor about a firm persuasion of the Mind as to the truth of what God hath revealed; but it is about that particular Act of Faith whereby we believe that our Sins are forgiven; and this is supposed to be the first Act of Saving Faith, and to be the true Manifestation, that such a Person's Sins are forgiven. And this is that which leads Men, we say, to Presumption, and hath no ground at all in Scripture. It is far from *Presumption* to believe what God hath declared and promised; for this is our Duty: It is no *Presumption* to apply the general Promises of For-

giveneſs of Sins to our ſelves; for without that, they cannot reach to our caſe, and therefore cannot afford ſufficient ground of inward Peace and ſatisfaction of Mind: It is no *Preſumption* to rely upon the truth of Divine Promiſes, nor to depend upon our Bleſſed Saviour for the performance of them; for this is conſequent upon our Perſuaſion that theſe Promiſes are Divine: But yet it may be great Preſumption to conclude, that *a Man's Sins are forgiven becauſe he believes that they are forgiven, being laid upon Chriſt:* For on what is this Connection founded? Where is it revealed? And if to believe a thing without ground be Preſumption, this muſt be ſo.

P. 105. But Dr. *Criſp* urges that Scripture, *While we were yet Sinners Chriſt died for us: If thou art a Sinner therefore, Chriſt died for thee.* And how then? muſt every Sinner believe, not only that Chriſt died for him, and that his Sins are forgiven, and if he can believe this, it is a mark of his Election; and what follows; then, here

here is univerſal Redemption aſſerted in its full extent; and what is more, here is an univerſal Election too, if all Men can believe that their Sins are forgiven: At leaſt it is a Conditional Election; and that is ground enough for Preſumption as to all ſuch as can believe that their Sins are forgiven. What can hinder any Man more from Repentance and forſaking his Sins, than to be told, that the firſt Act of Saving Faith is to believe that his Sins are forgiven? But the Goſpel preaches Repentance in order to Remiſſion of Sins; for when Chriſt ſent abroad his Apoſtles to preach to the World, the Meſſage was, *That Repentance* Luk 24.47. *and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be preached in his Name among all Nations.* Not that Men were to believe that their Sins are already forgiven, being laid upon Chriſt in his Suffering, although the Suffering of Chriſt be mentioned juſt before. And when S. *Peter* had the Holy Ghoſt upon him, and ſpake of the Sufferings of Chriſt, it is obſervable what pre-

Act. 3 19. ſently follows, *Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreſhing ſhall come from the preſence of the Lord.* What a different account is this from believing that your Sins are forgiven, and you may be ſure they are forgiven? And upon the Act. 2 38. very day of Pentecoſt, he ſaid, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Remiſſion of Sins.* Here is not only Repentance required for the Remiſſion of Sins; but *Baptiſm* too. And is not the Baptiſmal Covenant a Condition on our parts? It muſt be a mere piece of Pageantry, and an inſignificant Ceremony, if it doth not imply a Stipulation on the part of thoſe who are baptized. And what is a Stipulation, but a Federal Condition? ſo that thoſe who exclude Conditions from the Covenant of Grace, muſt make nothing of the Baptiſmal Covenant, as to any real Obligation on the Conſciences of Men. And how can thoſe be accounted Chriſtians who do ſo?

Theſe

Theſe things are ſo plain in Scripture, that I wonder how thoſe can account it the Rule of their Faith who deny them; but, whatever ſuch Men pretend they muſt take up their *Theological Meaſures*, as they call them, ſome other way. And it is not hard to gueſs what it is which makes ſuch Doctrines ſo Popular with thoſe, who have a mind to reconcile the Practice of gainful, and trading, and faſhionable Sins with an Intereſt in Chriſt; which is eaſily done, if no more be neceſſary to Remiſſion of Sins, but ſuch a Faith whereby they believe their Sins are already pardoned.

Whether this be the Reaſon of ſome Mens liking ſuch Doctrines above others I cannot ſay; but it is no wonder if they ſhould; and it is a dangerous Temptation for others to preach ſuch pleaſing Opinions, eſpecially when they are covered over with the very ſpecious Pretence of advancing the free Grace of God; which muſt be free indeed if no Conditions be required on our parts.

But then methinks they might as well exclude a Condition without as well as within them; and ſo there would be no need of the Satisfaction of Chriſt. For the *Abſolute Promiſes* of the New Covenant, on which ſo much weight is laid (without comparing them with other places of Scripture) ſpeak no more of Chriſt's Sufferings than they do of any Conditions in us: But to this they think they have a full Anſwer by attributing to God ſuch a ſort of Vindictive Juſtice, as requires an abſolute, and rigid, and perfect Satisfaction in the ſame kind for the Sins of Mankind. Now this one would think doth not agree well with the Notion of Debts (already examined) for what ſort of Vindictive Juſtice is that, which makes Debts ſo neceſſary to be paid *to the utmoſt Farthing?* But Dr. *Criſp* hath put both theſe together in ſeveral places.

P. 275. *The truth is*, ſaith he, *where-ever Sin is, the Juſtice of God will have plenary Satisfaction; for all the Sins in the World God will have full Satisfaction*

tisfaction either by the Sinner himſelf or by ſome Surety for him; Chriſt, ſeeing he hath taken the Sins of the Elect upon him, he muſt pay the full value, and his pay muſt be as full as the Reprobates in Hell, God will have the utmoſt Farthing.

Again, *When Chriſt came into the World, he paid down ready Money all at once, he paid for every Parcel at one Payment; God hath all from him, as they ſay, in ready Caſh.* P. 335.

And again, *From the actual laying Iniquity upon Chriſt, at that inſtant when he was upon the Croſs, God nailed the Sins of Men to the Croſs of Chriſt; and from that time, there was not one Sin to be reckoned, either to Believers, who are the Members of Chriſt, or to Chriſt himſelf; he having made Satisfaction, and upon it given out to the World, it is finiſhed. What is finiſhed? It is the payment of the Price ſo long look'd for; the utmoſt Farthing is now laid down.* P. 357.

But in other places he ſpeaks of *Chriſt's wearing out the Rod of Vengeance to the very Stumps:* And of P. 394.

God's

P. 274. *God's Juſtice, as a Blood-hound following the Scent of Blood, and ſeizes where-ever he finds it. If Chriſt take our Blood upon him, Juſtice will follow him, and ſeize upon him, as if he had been the very Perſon acting the Sin.*

What mean and unworthy Repreſentations are theſe of the *Divine Juſtice*, which is always accompanied with Infinite Wiſdom; and acts not here for Vengeance but to prevent it! God hath great, and wiſe, and becoming Ends to all the Divine Perfections in the *Sufferings of Chriſt* for us in order to our Redemption and Salvation. But ſuch kind of Notions as theſe, made Men abhor the Notion of *Satisfaction*, and gave all the advantages which they ever had againſt it. Therefore, if we would defend it ſucceſsfully, we muſt have a great deal of care not to run upon theſe *Antinomian Principles*; which muſt unavoidably carry us into ſuch Abſurdities, which will make our Adverſaries inſult and triumph; as we find they do in their late

late Pamphlets, when ever they encounter this Notion of Satisfaction. And they would make the World believe, that there is no other; which is a piece of Artifice in them; and if ever they prevail in their Undertakings, it must be only with such Persons who have espoused such an indefencible Notion of it. For the strength of all they say against the Doctrine of *Satisfaction* in the most correct Edition of the *Racovian Catechism*; (which if they have any, is to be look'd on as the Standard of their Doctrine) is, that the *Payment of the utmost Farthing* must exclude all Conditions on our side; so that the Notion of Satisfaction doth lay the Foundation of *Antinomianism:* which Dr. *Crisp* very well saw, and therefore by just Consequence built his Doctrine upon it.

Catech. Racov. p. 146.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The State of the Socinian *Controverſy Explain'd, with reſpect to the preſent Differences among Diſſenters about it.*

HAving thus far endeavoured to lay open the *Myſtery* of *Antinomianiſm*, and thereby to remove the falſe Principles on which the Doctrine of *Satisfaction* hath been maintained, I now come more cloſely to conſider the Charge of *Socinianiſm* upon thoſe who have appeared moſt vigorouſly againſt it. Among theſe, in your *Appeal*, you have ſingled out Mr. *Baxter*, who was remarkable for his Succeſsfull writing againſt them; and Mr. *Dan. Williams*, who hath made himſelf known to the World by his Examination of Dr. *Criſp*'s Opinions. I do not ſay it is upon that Account that you have endeavoured to repreſent them, as yielding too much

to

to the *Socinians*; for you declare againſt ſome of them your ſelf with great vehemency; but I may ſay, and hope to make it out, that it hath been only a miſtaken apprehenſion of the true ſtate of the Controverſy, which hath been the occaſion of all theſe Heats; and that there is no Cauſe for any real Difference among thoſe who are not *Antinomians*; either in the *Principles*, or the *Conſequences* which follow from them.

And therefore I ſhall immediately apply my ſelf to the ſeveral Heads of your *Appeal* in the Order you have placed them; and bring under each of them the Matters which lie diſperſed in your Book.

(1.) *About Chriſt's Sufferings being a proper Puniſhment of our Sins.*

As to this you produce ſeveral Paſſages out of Mr. *Baxter*'s Writings; wherein he denies *Chriſt's Sufferings to have been a proper Puniſhment of our Sins, but only ſaith that they were Improperly, Analogically.*

ly, and Materially Penal: that our Sins were not a proper Meritorious Cauſe, but only Occaſional of Chriſt's Sufferings; and that they were not from the Obligation of the Law, but only from his voluntary Undertaking: and that Mr. *Williams* follows him in thoſe *Notions*. For you look on him only as *the Acceſſory*, and the other *the Principal*.

In Examining this matter, we have two things to conſider.

1. In what Senſe this is aſſerted by Mr. *Baxter*.

2. How far this Senſe doth overthrow the Doctrine of *Satisfaction* and Mr. *W.* is concerned in it.

1. As to the Senſe in which theſe things are aſſerted by Mr. *Baxter*. For which we muſt have recourſe to his Writings, where he hath delivered his Opinion moſt clearly. I paſs over therefore his *Aphoriſms*, becauſe he declared afterwards, that he had expreſſed his Mind more fully in his other Books; eſpecially in his *Confeſſion of Faith*; purpoſely written for the clearing of himſelf.

In

In that Book, he owns, *p.* 3. that in his younger days, he was near being *enſnared by the Antinomian Doctrines; but afterwards he found them to be not only falſe but dangerous, and very apt to prevail upon weak and injudicious Minds, which excited his Zeal againſt them*; which expoſed him, as he ſaith, ſo much to the Hatred and Reproaches of thoſe who favour'd them.

In the *Confeſſion* of his Faith, *p.* 12. he expreſly owns not only *Chriſt to be God and one with the Father; but that taking our Nature upon him, he gave up himſelf a Sacrifice for our Sins, and a Ranſom for us in ſuffering Death upon the Croſs.* And afterwards, *p.* 152. he ſets down the *Antinomian* Doctrine on one ſide, the *Socinian* on the other, and his own as the *Truth* in the middle. The *Antinomian*, is thus delivered. *Jeſus Chriſt ſatisfied God's Juſtice as in the Perſon of all his Elect, ſo that in Law ſenſe and God's Account, they themſelves did ſatisfy in and by Chriſt. So that Chriſt's Sufferings were the full and*

and proper Execution of the threatning of the Law to Man; and ſo acquits them ipſo facto, *on the meer Suffering; and ſo it is theirs as paid and ſuffered by Chriſt, and accepted by God, without or before any further means of Conveyance or Application to give them a Right in it, or to its Fruits.*

The *Socinian* Doctrine is thus expreſſed. *That Jeſus Chriſt did not undergo any Penalty for our Sins, as the Meritorious, or Pro-meritorious Cauſe, but only as Occaſions; and that he did not make any Satisfaction to God's Juſtice for us, but only ſuffer from the cruelty of wicked Men, and not as from a juſt and offended God; and ſet us a Copy or Example of Patience by his Death for our Imitation.*

That which he puts down as the *Truth* is this. *Jeſus Chriſt as the Publick Sponſor did bear the Puniſhment deſerved by the Sins of the World, and made to his Father a Satisfaction ſufficient for all.* I need not repeat any more in this place; this being ſufficient to ſhew that he did reject the

the *Socinian Doctrine*; and owned that Chriſt *did bear the Puniſhment deſerved by Mankind, and made full Satisfaction to the Father.*

You may ſay, *it is no news for Mr.* Baxter *to be charged with contradicting himſelf.* And it is poſſible for a Man who writes much, and lives long, to fall into ſuch different ways of Expreſſing his Mind as by others may be taken for *Self-contradictions* which really are not ſo. But this muſt be narrowly examin'd, leſt we do Him or the Truth injury. We muſt therefore conſider the force of thoſe Expreſſions you produce out of him.

In his *Methodus Theologiæ* you ſay, *That he expreſly declares that the Sufferings of Chriſt as to the Reaſon of the thing, were only a Natural Evil undergone by Occaſion, and the remote Cauſality of the Sins of Mankind. Not that our Sins deſerved his Puniſhment; but becauſe unleſs our Sins had deſerved Puniſhment he had not undergone it. Becauſe there is no proper Puniſhment but for Sin; and ſo the*

Sufferings of Chriſt are only Puniſhment in an Improper and Analogical ſenſe.

This is the force of what you cite out of him, and to the ſame purpoſe you quote his Book of *Univerſal Redemption*, lately printed, but long ſince written; as appears by the *Poſtſcript* to his *Aphoriſms*, and by the Book it ſelf.

The chief Expreſſion in it, *p.* 91. is, *That Chriſt's Sufferings had no proper Meritorious Cauſe, but yet man's Sins were the* Pro-cauſa Meritoria; *he undertook to bear that Suffering, which for them was due to us (not to him.) And therefore when I ſay he bore the Sufferings due to us, I mean it* materialiter *only; ſuch Sufferings for kind and weight he bore, but his Obligation to bear them was only from his own Sponſion, and not from the Law. From theſe paſſages,* you ſay, *you fear a Deſign in ſome Followers againſt the Doctrine of a Real, Full, and Proper Satisfaction to God's Juſtice for our Sins. To which it is Eſſential, that Chriſt's Sufferings be truly and*

and properly Penal; and that our Sins be the near Impulſive Meritorious Cauſe of them; and that the Obligation thereunto ariſe from the ſanction of the Law. This latter part muſt be examined afterwards.

2. I now come to conſider how far this overthrows the Doctrine of Satisfaction. To which I anſwer,

1. It doth not appear how this touches Mr. *D. W.* the *Principal* in the *Accuſation*; although you ſuppoſe him but an *Acceſſory* in the *Doctrine.* And therefore it ought to have been made out, that Mr. *W.* had eſpouſed theſe Notions of Mr. *B.* for he might follow him in other things, and find reaſon to diſſent from him in this. Therefore I expected to find ſome Proof that Mr. *W.* had ſaid the ſame things as to this matter, which Mr. *B.* had done. But you only produce *the Complexion of his Writings, and their tendency and his Notions, Phraſes, Terms and Arguments to prove this Charge:* from whence you infer, *That he muſt with Mr.* B. *deny Chriſt's Sufferings to be* P. 13.

properly Penal. Now I appeal to your ſelf, whether in a matter of ſuch Conſequence as you apprehend this to be, it be juſt and reaſonable to charge one man with another's Opinions from general Preſumptions and Surmiſes? Eſpecially when he frequently owns the Sufferings of Chriſt to be a Puniſhment for our Sins, in oppoſition to the *Socinian* Doctrine. Either Mr. *B*s Doctrine as to this Matter falls in with the *Socinians* or it doth not; if not, why ſo much heat againſt it? If it doth, Mr. *W.* utterly diſowns it; for he expreſly rejects the *Socinian* Notion; as will appear by theſe places which I have obſerved in him. In the firſt place he makes no ſuch Diſtinctions of a *Pro-meritorious Cauſe and Analogical Puniſhments* as Mr. *B.* did. And he aſſerts Chriſt's Sufferings to be a *Puniſhment for our Sins*, in ſeveral places; as in theſe words: *But he was willing to bear the Puniſhment of our Crimes, that thereby he might merit our Forgiveneſs. True, it was for Sin or it had not been neceſſary;*

Man made Righteous p. 41.

neceſſary; nor yet a Puniſhment, &c.
Again, *Chriſt ſuffered the utmoſt Puniſhment which Juſtice required, and God propoſed for the Expiation of ſin.* P. 18.
And when he was accuſed of Principles tending to *Socinianiſm*, he gave this Anſwer. *The Socinian Principles are ſummarily reduced to that of the Trinity, and that of Chriſt's Satisfaction. They deny the Deity of Chriſt as the Son of God by Eternal Generation, we affirm it; they deny the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt, we affirm it. The malice of our Adverſaries cannot pretend to touch us here. The* Socinians *deny that Chriſt died a proper Sacrifice for Sin, we affirm it. They deny that Chriſt's Sufferings were the Puniſhment of our Sins, we affirm it. They deny that Chriſt ſatisfied Divine Juſtice, or died in our place, we affirm that he ſatisfied Juſtice, and that Chriſt died in our place and ſtead.* P. 229.
And in another place, *I aſſert Chriſt's Sufferings to be Puniſhment ſatisfactory to Juſtice for our Sins.* And you tell me, that you agree with me, That the true Controverſy between the *Socinians* Anſw. to Mr. J. H. p. 7. Appeal, p. 7.

nians and us lies here, Whether the Sufferings of Chriſt were to be conſidered as a Puniſhment for our Sins, or as Dominion only over an Innocent Perſon in order to his Advancement to Glory. If you agree in this, and Mr. *W.* ſo freely owns that Chriſt's Sufferings were a Puniſhment for our Sins; how come you to ſuſpect that his Notions tend to *Socinianiſm?* And in his late *Animadverſions* on your *Defence* of the *Report*, p. 80, he ſaith, *That he joyned with his Brethren in ſaying that the Puniſhment of our Sins was inflicted on Chriſt; that God might without injury to his Juſtice, pardon and ſave Penitent Believers. Is this a* Socinian *Error? Or is a Word wanting to make Chriſt's Sufferings proper Puniſhments? Nay, what is it to anſwer for our Violations? Is not to anſwer for our Sins another thing than* Socinians *hold? Even this is no leſs than ſuffering the Puniſhment of our Sins; if we were for violating the Law under its Obligations to ſuffer thoſe Puniſhments.*

But

But you may ſay, *That all this is meer Sophiſtry, and that he means only Puniſhment Materially and Analogically, as Mr.* B. *doth, although he finds it neceſſary to be more cautious and reſerved in his Expreſſions:* but I ſee no cauſe for ſuch a ſuſpicion as to Mr. *W.* I come therefore,

(2.) To conſider whether Mr. *Baxter*'s own words do lay him open to the ſuſpicion of going too far towards the *Socinians* in this matter. For, in this caſe we muſt diſtinguiſh the Scripture Notion of *Puniſhment* from a ſtrict and Philoſophical ſenſe of it. The Scripture ſpeaks in general of *Chriſt's bearing our Sins, and our Iniquities being laid upon him, and his being made Sin for us*, &c. but not a word of *ſtrict and proper Puniſhment*; but of that which was Appointed and Accepted in order to *Atonement* for our Sins, as the *Impulſive Cauſe*, becauſe the Nature of the Expreſſions do imply it; which becomes *Meritorious* by his voluntary undertaking it.

But Mr. *B.* it ſeems could not ſatisfy himſelf with the General Terms of Scripture; but was reſolved to enquire into the *Nature and Reaſon of the thing it ſelf*; and from thence he found theſe things, as *to Sin and Puniſhment*; which he thought fit to be conſidered.

Meth. Theol *Part* 3. *c.* 1. Def. 5.

1. *That Puniſhment is a Natural Evil inflicted for a Moral Evil; wherein the Matter is the Evil it ſelf as Natural; the Form,* as he calls it, *the Reſpect to the Meritorious Cauſe.*

2. *That the Name of Puniſhment is in it ſelf ambiguous; becauſe it relates to Puniſhment juſtly inflicted, and that which is not; the former is proper Puniſhment, the 2d is only Analogically ſo.* Here *Analogical Puniſhment* is that which is unjuſtly inflicted, if it be therefore juſtly it muſt be *proper Puniſhment.*

3. *The firſt and moſt natural ſenſe of Puniſhment is, when the Offender himſelf ſuffers for his Fault; but there may be two other Reaſons of Puniſhment, which he calls* Analogical; *becauſe they do not immediately follow Perſonal*

Perſonal Guilt; *and thoſe are either from nearneſs of Relation*; *as Subjects for Princes, and Children for Parents*; *or by voluntary Sponſion, as in vicarious Puniſhments.* (By which we are not to underſtand, as you ſeem to eſtimate, that which is *vice pœnæ, or Inflict ion inſtead of Puniſhment*; but it is a Real Puniſhment by Subſtitution of one in the place of another.) Def. of the Rep.

From hence he inferrs, *That ſince Chriſt did not ſuffer as a Sinner, therefore his Puniſhment could not be proper in the ſtricteſt ſenſe*; and ſo it muſt be *Analogical*, becauſe *not immediately conſequent upon the Fault*, but by the *Voluntary Act of another perſon*. For, *in the Reaſon of the thing he allows only the Sinner himſelf to be capable of the Puniſhment*; i. e. *in the primary ſenſe of it.* But if he that undergoes *the Puniſhment* for another by his own Act, be juſtly puniſhed upon his voluntary Sponſion, then, I ſay, the Fault of another becomes *a meritorious Cauſe* as to him, or there muſt be *Injuſtice* in the Puniſhment.

For

For he diſtinguiſhes between *a Puniſhment upon a falſe Imputation, which he calls Unjuſt, but Analogical; and a Puniſhment of another by Conſent, which he calls Analogical, but not Unjuſt.* But if the Puniſhment be *juſt*, the Cauſe muſt be juſt; it could not be juſt with reſpect to his own Fault, for none is ſuppoſed; therefore there may be a juſt Puniſhment for another's Fault; and if ſo, that may be truly ſaid to be the *Meritorious Cauſe* of it, and the Puniſhment *a proper Puniſhment*, although for another's Fault. But that which led Mr. *B.* into the denying of it was, the *Antinomians* making Chriſt *to undergo the proper Puniſhment of our Sin, becauſe our Perſonal Guilt was according to them transferred upon him*; but he finding this Principle to be the Foundation of *Antinomianiſm*, and that this could not be true, he therefore denied *Chriſt's Puniſhment* to be *proper*, as it is *oppoſed* to *Analogical*. For he ſaith, That *in a proper ſenſe our Sins could never be the Sins of Chriſt, becauſe the ſame Accident*

Def. 7.

cident cannot belong to divers Subjects. Which is true; but from thence he concludes, *That ſince our Sins could not be in Chriſt, he could not be ſaid to be properly puniſhed for them; ſince the Guilt of the Fault as ſuch muſt ſtick to the Sinner, but the Guilt of the Fault as to the Puniſhment may be transferr'd: and becauſe there can be no Puniſhment without reſpect to a Fault, therefore* he ſaith *they were Analogical Puniſhments on the Account of the Sins of Mankind.* But then, as you truly cite his words, *he makes our Sins not to be the Meritorious Cauſe of them, but a kind of pro-meritorious, or occaſional Cauſe.*

But we muſt do him right, ſo far as to take notice, that in ſtating the *Socinian Controverſie*, he makes it to conſiſt, *in denying that Chriſt did undergo any Penalty for our Sins as the Meritorious or Pro-meritorious Cauſe, but only as Occaſions.* And yet here he makes the *Pro-meritorious Cauſe and the Occaſional* to be the ſame; and he denies, *That our Sins were the Meritorious Cauſe; but only becauſe if we had not ſinned he had not ſuffered.*

Theſe

These Expressions, I grant, taken alone, yield too much to the *Socinians*, who do not deny our Sins to have been *a Remote, Impulsive* and *Occasional Cause of Christ's Sufferings*; but deny them to be the *Meritorious Cause* of them.

What then? must we give up Mr. *B.* to them? By no means. For how could he be a *Socinian* who so frankly on all occasions owned the Doctrines of the *Trinity and Satisfaction?* But these things may be said for his Vindication.

1. That by laying all the Passages together, he must mean something more by his *Pro-meritorious Cause* than merely *a Remote Occasional Cause*; because, in setting down the *Socinian Doctrine*, he plainly distinguishes between the *Pro-meritorious Cause and the Occasions*; and saith, the *Socinians* allow one and not the other. How can this be, if they were the same? How came his *Pro-meritorious Cause* to be in one place the same with *Occasional*, and in the other as distinct from it as the *Socinian Doctrine*

ctrine is from ours? Therefore it is but a reaſonable Interpretation of his latter words, to ſuppoſe that he meant more than that our Sins were only a *Remote Occaſion* of Chriſt's Sufferings.

2. A *Meritorious Cauſe* may be conſidered two ways.

1. Antecedently to any Act of the Legiſlator; and as it relates to what follows from *the nature of the thing* of which Mr. *B.* ſpeaks; and ſo, *Inherent Guilt* is the *only Meritorious Cauſe of Puniſhment*; for that doth naturally belong to it, and Puniſhment can be only deſerved by it, as Mr. *B.* truly obſerves.

2. Conſequently to the Legiſlator's Act in admitting another by his own Conſent to undergo the Puniſhment which the Offender deſerved; and ſo the Law transferrs the Guilt of the Puniſhment to the Innocent Perſon without any Injuſtice; as Mr. *B.* confeſſes, when he allows *vicarious Puniſhments*; or one ſuffering by *voluntary Sponſion* in another's place. Now in this caſe, no Man

Man can ſay, that Antecedently the Fault of the Offender was any more than an *Occaſional Cauſe* of the Innocent Perſon's ſuffering; but taking all together, when he is admitted to ſuffer in the place of the Guilty, the Law with the Puniſhment makes the *Impulſive Cauſe* become *Meritorious*, as it is the immediate Reaſon of his Sufferings. The only Queſtion then is, whether this can properly be called a *Meritorious Cauſe*. To anſwer this, that Expreſſion may be taken in two Senſes.

1. In the ſtrict and proper Senſe, and ſo it follows Perſonal and Inherent Guilt; and this your ſelf deny to have been in Chriſt.

2. In the Senſe of the Law; and ſo that which is the near Impulſive Cauſe may be truly ſaid to be Meritorious, as to his Sufferings; For our Sins were the immediate Reaſons of them; becauſe they made it an Act of Juſtice, which otherwiſe had been only an Act of Power and Dominion.

3. The

3. The main Point in Controverſie between us and the *Socinians*, is not about the Senſe of a *Meritorious* and *Pro-meritorious Cauſe*, and how they are to be diſtinguiſhed from each other; nor about the moſt ſtrict and proper Senſe of Puniſhment, which muſt ſuppoſe Inherent Guilt, which cannot be in the Caſe of our Saviour (and your ſelf grant, that the ſuppoſition is *falſe and blaſphemous*;) but it is, whether Chriſt did really undergo the Puniſhment of our Sins, in order to the being a Sacrifice of Atonement for them. And in this, we have Mr. *B*'s Conſent expreſſed on all Occaſions; and ſome Liberty muſt be allow'd to *Metaphyſical Heads* to ſhew their Skill in Diſtinctions above other Men; and ſometimes, when there is no cauſe for them. But we muſt not preſently charge Men with Hereſie for new invented Diſtinctions; wherein they may be allowed to pleaſe themſelves, ſo they do not cumber the Faith with them; nor be too ſharp upon their Brethren for not apprehending the uſe of them. There

There is a remarkable Story in the Hiſtory of the *Synod* of *Dort*, which may not be improper in this place. There were in one of the Univerſities of that Country two Profeſſors, both very warm and extreamly zealous for that which they accounted the *moſt Orthodox Doctrine*; but it happened, that one of theſe accuſed the other before the Synod for no fewer than 50 *Errors*, tending to *Socinianiſm*, *Pelagianiſm*, &c. and wonderful Heat there was on both ſides. At laſt, a Committee was appointed to examin this dreadful Charge, and upon Examinations they found no ground for the Charge of *Socinianiſm* or any other Hereſie, but only that he had aſſerted too much the uſe of *Ambiguous and Scholaſtick Terms*, and endeavoured to bring in the way of the *School-men* in his Writings; and therefore the Synod diſmiſs'd him, with that prudent Advice, rather to *keep to the Language of the Scriptures than of the Schools*. I ſhall make no Application.

S. Lubbertus. I. Maccovius.

Where

Where we are well aſſured, that Perſons keep to the main Point of Faith, we ought to give the moſt favourable Interpretation to ſome peculiar Modes of ſpeaking, which appear to have more Subtilty and Art in them; for ſome Men will be always ready to ſhew the goodneſs and ſtrength of their Eye-ſight by diſtinguiſhing things quite out of the view of other Men; and ſometimes it is poſſible that they may take the Shadows in their Eyes for real and diſtinct Objects without them. All that I aim at is, to keep Men as much as may be, within the Bounds of the Chriſtian Faith; without raiſing new Difficulties by new Phraſes and Subtilties, which reach not to the Common Faith; but if any will do ſo, let not others make more than there is, of ſuch Peculiarities, and preſently ſuſpect that they are carrying on Deſigns to undermine the Fundamental Articles of our Religion.

But before I diſmiſs this Particular, I muſt take notice of what you ſay relating to it.

P. 39. As, (1.) *That the* Unitarians *in one of their late Pamphlets do ſay, That though Chriſt did not undergo Puniſhment properly ſo called, yet he did ſo in a Popular Senſe of Puniſhment; and ſo they grant as much as Mr.* B.

To this, I anſwer, That the Caſe is not the ſame: For Mr. *B.* we find on all occaſions aſſerts *Chriſt's being the Eternal Son of God, and taking our Nature upon him; and bearing the Puniſhment deſerved by our Sins, and making Satisfaction to the Father for the Sins of Mankind:* Can any *Unitarian* ſay this and be ſtill an *Unitarian?* I know their preſent Writers are a ſort of ſlippery Gentlemen, who will pretend to very ſmooth things that you may take no hold of them. And even in the Article of the *Trinity*, which they have endeavoured with all their Buffoonry to expoſe and Ridicule, now they find that will not do, they would

would fain come to Terms of Accommodation, and claim the Benefit of *Explications*; which others, ſay they, are excuſed by. So in one of their lateſt Pamphlets, we are told, *That they profeſs to believe the Article of the Trinity:* they may as well ſay, *they profeſs to believe Tranſubſtantiation*; and may as well call themſelves *Divines* of the *Church of* Rome *as of the Church of* England. For it is inconſiſtent with *Moral Honeſty*, or *the Probity of a Deiſt*, for any Man who is in his Heart an *Unitarian* to profeſs himſelf *a Divine of the Church of* England: for he muſt be a *Divine* without *Conſcience*, or any regard to *the Faith* or *Worſhip* which he joyns in the profeſſion of. For can any Church more expreſsly declare her Senſe as to *the Doctrine of the Trinity*, than ours has done, in her *Articles*, *Creeds*, *Doxologies*, *Litanies*, &c. And can any Men that in their Hearts believe not a Tittle of it, (as it hath been always underſtood in the Chriſtian Church) yet profeſs themſelves to be *Divines*

The grounds and occaſions of the Controverſie concerning the Unity of God, p. 12.

of ſuch a Church? They may better call themſelves *Jews* and *Mahometans*; for they agree far better with them as to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. But theſe Men of Sincerity only pretend *not to litigate about*
P. 32. *Terms and Words*; and therefore are *for taking them in their own Senſe*, and ſo will interpret away our Creeds, and Articles, and Prayers; if they can but find out ſome kind of Senſe which they can underſtand them in. And by this new Invention a Man may profeſs to believe a God, and mean no more by it, than *Spinoza* did; ſo that there can be no certainty of any Mens Faith or Religion by their Profeſſions and Subſcriptions and outward Acts of Worſhip.

But, ſay they, *Why may not ſome mens Explications be allowed as well as others*? For very good Reaſons; becauſe ſome mens Explications are conſiſtent with the Articles of Faith and others are not: and becauſe ſome men give not ſo much occaſion to ſuſpect their Sincerity as others do:

do: and for this Cauſe I do think a more favourable Senſe ought to be put on Mr. *Baxter*'s words than on theirs.

But their greateſt Clamour is, *That ſuch Explications are allowed as infer arrant Tritheiſm; and although Men out of their Charity may forgive the Tritheiſm of theſe Heatheniſh Writers, yet they can never make Three Infinite Minds to be but One God.* But the true Queſtion is not, *Whether Three Diſtinct and Separate Minds make Three Gods; but whether Three Perſons in the Trinity do ſo?* And even *Crellius* himſelf could have told them, *That the holding Three Perſons in one and the ſame Individual Eſſence cannot make any real or perfect Tritheiſm.* And although he doth not allow the Notion to be *True* or *Conſiſtent*, yet he thinks the charge of *Tritheiſm* doth not hold, *becauſe of that cloſe and inſeparable union between the Perſons and the Divine Eſſence.* And although men may put a wrong Notion upon *Perſon* or *Hypotheſis*; yet as long as they aſſert

P. 12, 22.

Crell. Eth. Chriſtian. l. 3. c. 2 in Addend. Ed. 1681.

One Individual Divine Eſſence in the *Three Diſtinct Perſons*, the Error lies rather in the Explication than in the Doctrine of the Trinity. But there is a great difference between theſe, and thoſe who believe no Diſtinction of Perſons at all; and although they would now ſeem to oppoſe only the *Tritheiſtick Doctrine*, as they call it; yet Mankind cannot be ſo forgetful, as not to call to mind that their firſt oppoſition was to what they called the *Athanaſian Religion*; or that Doctrine of the Trinity which is contained in the Creed under the Name of *Athanaſius*; which we take to be a true *Explication* of it; and therefore thoſe who contradict that, cannot by us be allowed the Benefit of their *Explications*.

P. 7. (2.) You object, *That Legal Guilt lying in an Oligation to Puniſhment where Puniſhment is juſtly inflicted, Guilt muſt be ſuppoſed as a neceſſary Antecedent thereto.* Of this there is no Queſtion; for Sin and Puniſhment have a neceſſary Reſpect to each other:

other: but the Queſtion is, Whether Perſonal Guilt muſt be ſuppoſed; for then it follows, either that Chriſt's Death could not be a Puniſhment for Sin in any true ſenſe, or that our *Perſonal Guilt* muſt be tranſferred upon Chriſt, which you deny. But we ſay that *Puniſhment* may be juſtly inflicted, where there was a Tranſlation of Guilt by Relaxation of the Law as to Perſonal Offenders; and admitting a Mediator to ſuffer in their ſtead.

But, ſay you, *Rectoral Juſtice doth eſſentially reſpect the Law in its Diſtributions, and never inflicts Sufferings on any but for Sin as their Meritorious Cauſe. If a Rector ſentenceth any to Sufferings without a Regard to Sin, it is unjuſt. Whatever a Sovereign in exerting Acts of Dominion may do in this caſe, a Rector cannot juſtly inflict Sufferings on an Innocent Perſon as ſuch.* Here I grant, you have come up to the true ſtate of the Caſe between the *Socinians* and *Us*. For, whatever they ſometimes ſeem to pretend, they do not allow

Chriſt's Sufferings to have any Relation to Juſtice as a *Puniſhment for Sin in any true Senſe*; but only that they were the Exerciſe of God's Dominion over him, or of his Sovereign Power. It's true, they ſay that the Sins of Mankind may be ſaid to have been an Occaſional Cauſe in this Reſpect, *that if we had not Sinned Chriſt had not Suffered:* but this kind of Cauſe hath no Influence upon the Effect which follows upon it; which is produced by its true and proper Cauſes. As for inſtance, a Modern Philoſopher, of great Eſteem among ſome, hath aſſerted, *that Mankind are only the Occaſional Cauſes of their own Senſations*; i. e. that nothing done by us in Seeing or Hearing is the Cauſe of that we call Senſation; but that ſuch a Local Motion being ſuppoſed, God himſelf doth immediately produce in us thoſe Ideas, which we call Senſations: and ſo he takes away all *Efficacy from Second Cauſes*; and thereby makes Mankind to have lived under a perpetual Deluſion, and God to

be

be the Soul of the World. But I only mention it here to ſhew, that thoſe who aſſert ſuch *Occaſional Cauſes* do take away all kind of Efficacy from them. For, an *Occaſional Cauſe* is really no Cauſe at all; but ſomething that is ſuppoſed in order to the true Cauſe's producing its Effect. As the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary* being at *Bethlehem* in the time of the *Inrolment*, was the *Occaſional Cauſe* of our Saviour's being born there; but will any one ſay, that this was a *True Cauſe* of our Saviour's being born at *Bethlehem?* And yet we may ſay, that if there had been no ſuch place as *Bethlehem*, and the Bleſſed Virgin had not been there, he could not have been born there. And ſo the Fire of *London* was the *Occaſional Cauſe* of the *Monument*, for if there had been no Fire, there had been no Monument; but will any man ſay therefore, that this was a Cauſe of the Monument? The moſt that can be allowed to an *Occaſional Cauſe* is to make it a Remote *Impulſive Cauſe*; and ſo the Miſery of

of Mankind by Sin was the Cauſe of Chriſt's Suffering; as the Diſeaſes of Mankind are the Occaſional Cauſe of the Study and Practice of Phyſick: for if there had been no Diſeaſes, there would have been no need of Phyſicians. And this is all that they can make of our Sins being the Cauſes of Chriſt's Death; *viz.* that they were an Occaſion of his coming to bear the Diſeaſes of Mankind; which becauſe his Preaching the Doctrine of the Goſpel could not extend far enough to do, therefore he thought fit to confirm his Doctrine by his Death; upon which followed the Preaching of it to the World, and upon that Repentance and Amendment of Life; and ſuch a Power in Chriſt as to be able to ſave all ſuch as truly Repented.

This is the true Account of the *Socinian Scheme*, after all their Refinings of it in the laſt Edition of the *Racovian Catechiſm:* by which it appears that they do not allow the Sufferings of Chriſt to be a Puniſhment for Sin in any true and proper Senſe;

Senſe; but only an Act of Sovereignty in God. What you ſay, *That a Rector cannot inflict juſtly Sufferings on an Innocent Perſon*, is the *Socinian* Argument againſt Chriſt's Satisfaction; but when you add *as ſuch*, I ſuppoſe you thereby allow *Chriſt's Suffering juſtly* as taking our Sins upon him; which is the thing we aſſert againſt them; and *if he ſuffered juſtly* on that Account, then his Sufferings were a true and proper Puniſhment. For whatever is inflicted for Sin is ſo, although not in the moſt ſtrict and proper ſenſe, which ſuppoſes inherent Guilt. And this is all that *Grotius* and *Voſſius* mean in the places you cite out of them; *viz.* That our Sins were an Antecedent and Impulſive Cauſe as to Chriſt's Sufferings; and ſo they were a true and proper Puniſhment; but they never could imagin it in the moſt ſtrict and proper Senſe; for they never ſaid that Chriſt ſuffered the very ſame which we were to have ſuffered; which was Puniſhment in the ſtricteſt Senſe; but that which P. 39, 40.

which was properly a Puniſhment with reſpect to Sin, and which God accepted as a *full, perfect, and ſufficient Sacrifice for the Sins of Mankind.*

The Summ of what I have ſaid on this Argument is this; That the moſt proper ſenſe of Puniſhment is that which belongs to Perſonal Guilt; ſo that either Chriſt could not ſuffer the moſt proper Puniſhment; or the Perſonal Guilt of our Sins muſt be transferred upon him. But ſince you deny this, you muſt yield Puniſhment to be taken in a ſenſe leſs proper, but yet a true Puniſhment for Sin and properly ſo called; becauſe Sin was the near Impulſive Cauſe of it. Therefore, thoſe who do aſſert the Sufferings of Chriſt to have been a true Puniſhment for Sin have no reaſon to be condemned and cenſured as approaching to *Socinianiſm.* For, if this hold all muſt be either *Antinomians* or *Socinians*; but as you deſire to avoid both extremes your ſelf, ſo I hope you will allow your Brethren the

ſame

ſame liberty, although they may differ in ſome modes of Expreſſion from you.

(2.) *Of the Change of Perſons between Chriſt and Us; and of Chriſt's ſuffering in our ſtead.*

This Article about the *Commutation of Perſons* was thought fit to be pitched upon as the Foundation of a New Charge upon Mr. *W*'s Book. From hence a great heat hath riſen about the Senſe of it; and I perceive by your Appeal, *p.* 43. that there is ſo much *Diſſatisfaction* ſtill among the Diſſenting Brethren that *they will not Renounce the Antinomian Errors till ſatisfaction be given as to what Mr.* W. *is charged with.* Now this to me ſeems to be a very ſtrange method of Proceeding. If they do really think the *Antinomian Errors* to be *Errors* indeed, why muſt the Renouncing them depend upon Mr. *W*'s giving them ſatisfaction in this matter? Suppoſe the other ſide had ſaid, *That they would not Renounce the*

the Socinian or Arminian Doctrines till Mr. C. *Mr.* Ch. *Mr.* M. &c. *had cleared themſelves of Antinomianiſm*, would this have been thought a reaſonable Excuſe? Would they not have ſaid, that now they ſhew indeed what Fondneſs they had for thoſe Opinions, when they put it upon ſuch terms which they thought would never be accepted of? If it hold on one ſide, it muſt on the other too. But I ſhall take no advantage of ſuch an unaccountable Stiffneſs; but proceed to an Impartial Examination of this matter, as it lies on both ſides. Which will require the laying open briefly, the Riſe and Progreſs of this Diſpute; and then conſider what Difference there ſtill remains; and what are the beſt means to compoſe it.

1. As to the *Riſe* and *Progreſs* of this Diſpute, we muſt look for it in Dr. *Criſp*; whoſe Opinions Mr. *W.* undertook to Confute. Now his
P. 270. words are, *Mark it well, Chriſt himſelf is not ſo compleatly Righteous, but we are as Righteous as he was; nor*

we

we ſo compleatly Sinful, but Chriſt became, being made Sin, as compleatly Sinful as we.——So that here is a direct Change; Chriſt takes our Perſons and Condition and ſtands in our ſtead, we take Chriſt's Perſon and Condition and ſtand in his ſtead. Theſe words are not denied to be D. *Criſp's*, and they are no ſudden or occaſional Expreſſions; but are grounded upon his main Principle of the Tranſlation of our Perſonal Guilt upon Chriſt and his Perſonal Righteouſneſs on Believers: So that here is no force or ſtrain upon his words.

Now to this Mr. *W.* ſaith, *The Difference is, whether there be a Change of Perſon between Chriſt and Believers? This the Doctor affirms and I deny.* The Queſtion hence aroſe, whether theſe Words could be reaſonably extended beyond that Senſe in which the Dr. aſſerted it? None could deny but there might be other Senſes of the Change of Perſons; but in ſuch a caſe by all reaſonable ways of interpreting the Senſe of Ambiguous Words, we muſt have

have recourſe to the true Occaſion of them. And I muſt declare that I can ſee no reaſon for the heat that hath been about the Difference of the Phraſe, of *Change of Perſon*, *and Change of Perſons*. But that I may expreſs my Senſe of this matter more diſtinctly, I ſhall do it in theſe particulars.

(1.) That Mr. *W.* did not invent the Phraſe of *Change of Perſon* to cover an ill meaning: But you ſeem to intimate ſo much, when you ſay, *That it was not known till he ſtarted it; and that it is a Phraſe only adjuſted to expreſs no more than what the* Socinians *do conſtantly grant; and by it you think is meant, a Change of Chriſt's Perſon from Eaſe to Pain for our Good.* But if you had carefully looked into the words of Dr. *Criſp*, you could not but obſerve that he took the Phraſe from him. *Chriſt takes our Perſons and Condition and ſtands in our ſtead; we take Chriſt's Perſon and Condition and ſtand in his ſtead.* And ſoon after, *So that, if you will reckon well, you muſt always reckon*

Def. of the Rep. p. 35.

reckon your ſelf in another's Perſon, and that other in your Perſon. Here is *a Change of Perſon* owned by Dr. *Cr.* and by it he underſtands the Tranſlation of Believers Perſonal Guilt upon Chriſt, and his Perſonal Righteouſneſs on them; ſo that thereby *Chriſt is become as ſinful as they, and they as compleatly righteous as he.* His words can have no other meaning. And not long after, *That Sacrifice of his made the Exchange, that by virtue of this we became that which Chriſt was, and Chriſt became that which we were.* Why then do you charge Mr. *W.* with inventing this Phraſe to ſerve the *Socinians*; when he denied it, becauſe he found it uſed by the *Antinomians?* But how came this Phraſe to be invented by Mr. *W.* to gratify the *Socinians*, when he ſaith that Dr. *Cr.* affirmed the Change of Perſon and he denied it? Would he invent it on purpoſe to ſerve them and deny it when he had done? This makes him not very capable of doing them any great Service, if he had a mind to

Answ. to the Defence, p. 91. it. But Mr. *W.* ſaith for himſelf, *That he did not invent the Phraſe of Change of Perſon, but uſed and cited it as Dr.* Criſp's; *and that this was all he denied, and not a Change of Perſons, which he fully aſſerted.* What is to be done in this caſe? You charge him with inventing a Phraſe to ſerve the *Socinians*, and he denies the Phraſe and the Senſe of it; you charge him with denying *the Change of Perſons*; and he expreſly owns and aſſerts it.

Appeal, p. 16. Defence, p. 30, 31. All that I can find that you have to plead for your ſelf is, *That his Friend and Defender denies the Change of Perſons; and aſſerts that a Change of Perſon may be allowed in a good ſenſe; that he oppoſes a Change of Perſons, and ſets up a Change of Perſon ſingular.* Suppoſe all this to be true. What follows? *Then he took a wrong way to defend him.* Grant that, how doth it appear from thence that Mr. *W.* muſt ſuffer for the Miſtakes of a Friend? And yet even he hath ſufficiently cleared his meaning when he ſaith, *That Mr.* W. *denied*

Appeal, p. 17.

Rebuke, p. 38.

denied nothing, was concerned to deny nothing but what the Dr. had affirmed; but the Dr. had affirmed a wild monſtrous ſenſe of Change of Perſons between Chriſt and the Elect or Believers; and therefore Mr. W. did not, could not deny any thing elſe, according to all the Rules and Laws of Pertinent Diſcourſe. This is plain Reaſoning without any quirks of Wit to leſſen the force of it. And ſoon after, ſetting down Dr. *Criſp*'s words, he ſaith, *And now you have it, what is that Change of Perſons, which the Dr. affirms and Mr. W. denies, which had he not, he had denied his Redeemer and betrayed the Goſpel.* P. 39. Theſe are ſevere words, but they ſhew what his true Apprehenſion was of the Change of Perſons as denied by Mr. *W.* which could be no other than that Senſe in which Dr. *Cr.* aſſerted it, whether it be Change of Perſon, or Change of Perſons.

F I N I S.

Books written by the Right Reverend Father in God, Edw. Stillingfleet, *D.D. late L. Biſhop of* Worceſter, *and ſold by* Henry Mortlock *at the* Phœnix *in St.* Paul's *Church-Yard.*

A Rational account of the Grounds of the Proteſtant Religion; being a Vindication of the Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*'s Relation of a Conference, *&c.* from the pretended Anſwer of *T. C.* Wherein the true Grounds of Faith are cleared, and the falſe diſcovered, and the Church of *England* vindicated from the Imputation of Schiſm; and the moſt Important Controverſies between us and thoſe of the Church of *Rome* throughly examined. The 2d Edition. *Fol.*

Origines Britanicæ, or the Antiquities of the *Britiſh* Churches, with a Preface concerning ſome pretended Antiquities relating to *Britain*, in Vindication of the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*. *Fol.*

Irenicum, a Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wound. *Quarto.*

Origines Sacræ, Or a Rational account of the Grounds of Chriſtian Faith, as to the Truth and Divine Authority of the Script. and the matters therein contain'd. *Quarto.* This is now printing in *Folio* with Additions.

The Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, or an Impartial Account of the Hiſtory, Nature and Pleas of the preſent Separation from the Communion of the Ch. of *England*. 2d Edition. *Quarto.*

A Let-

A Letter to Mr. *G.* giving a true Account of a late Conference at the D. of *P*'s.

A Second Letter to Mr. *G.* in anſwer to two Letters lately publiſhed concerning the Conference at the D. of *P*'s.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature and Grounds of the certainty of Faith, in anſwer to *J. S.* his Catholick Letters.

The Council of *Trent* Examin'd and Diſprov'd by Catholick Tradition, in the main Points in Controverſie between Us and the Church of *Rome*; with a particular Account of the Times and Occaſions of Introducing them. Part I. To which a Preface is prefixed concerning the True Senſe of the Council of *Trent*, and the Notion of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, and the hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it. *Octavo.*

An Anſwer to ſeveral late Treatiſes occaſioned by a Book entituled, A Diſcourſe concerning the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, and the hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it; Part I. *Octavo.*

A Second Diſcourſe in Vindication of the Proteſtant Grounds of Faith, againſt the pretence of Infalibility in the *Roman* Church, in Anſwer to the Guide in Controverſie, by *R. H.* Proteſtancy without Principles, and Reaſon and Religion; or the certain Rule of Faith, by *E. W.* with a particular enquiry into the Miracles of the *Roman* Church. *Octavo.*

An Anſwer to Mr. *Creſſy*'s Epiſtle apologetical to a Perſon of Honour, touching his Vindication of Dr. *Stillingfleet*. *Octavo.*

A Defence of the Diſcourſe concerning the

Idolatry practiſed in the Church of *Rome*, in anſwer to a Book entituled, Catholicks no Idolaters: *Octavo.*

Several Conferences between a *Roman* Prieſt, a Phanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of *England*; being a full Anſwer to the late Dialogues of *T. G. Octavo.*

A Diſcourſe concerning Bonds of Reſignation of Benefices in point of Law and Conſcience, in *Octavo.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Illegality of the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion, in anſwer to the Vindication and Defence of it: wherein the true notion of the Legal Supremacy is cleared; and an Account is given of the Nature, Original and Miſchief of the Diſpenſing Power.

The Grand Queſtion concerning the Biſhops Right to vote in Parliament in Caſes Capital ſtated and argued, from the Parliament Rolls and the Hiſtory of former times; with an Enquiry into their Peerage, and Three Eſtates in Parliament. *Octavo.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction; or the true Reaſons of his Sufferings; with an Anſwer to the *Socinian* Objections. To which is added, A Sermon concerning the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Faith, Preached *April* 7. 1691. With a Preface concerning the true ſtate of the Controverſie about Chriſt's Satisfaction. The Second Edition. 8*vo.*

Sermons preached upon ſeveral Occaſions in 3 Volumes 8*vo.*

A Fourth Volume will be publiſhed in a little time, never before printed.

A Diſcourſe in Vindication of the Doctrine of

of the Trinity: with an Anſwer to the late *Socinian* Objections againſt it, from Scripture, Antiquity and Reaſon. And a Preface concerning the different Explications of the Trinity, and the Tendency of the preſent *Socinian* Controverſie. The ſecond Edition. 8*vo*.

The Biſhop of *Worceſter*'s Anſwer to Mr. *Lock*'s Letter concerning ſome Paſſages relating to his Eſſay of Humane Underſtanding, mentioned in the late Diſcourſe in Vindication of the Trinity. With a Poſtſcript in Anſwer to ſome Reflections made on that Treatiſe in a late *Socinian* Pamphlet.

An Anſwer to Mr. *Lock*'s 2d Letter; wherein his Notion of *Ideas* is proved to be inconſiſtent with it ſelf, and with the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith. 8*vo*.

Eccleſiaſtical Caſes relating to the Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy ſtated and reſolved according to the Principles of Conſcience and Law. 8*vo*.

The Rule of Faith: Or an Anſwer to the Treatiſe of Mr. *J. S.* entituled, *Sure-footing*, *&c.* by *John Tillotſon*, D. D. to which is adjoyned, a Reply to Mr. *J. S*'s third Appendix, *&c.* by *Edward Stillingfleet*, D. D.

The Effigies of the Right Reverend Father in God, *Edward* Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*, Engraven on a Copper-plate by *Robert White*. Price 6*d*.

The Antiquities of *Nottinghamſhire*, Extracted out of Records, Original Evidences, Leiger-Books, and other Manuſcripts, and Authentick Authorities; beautified with Maps, Proſpects and Portraictures; by *Rob. Thornton* Dr. of Phyſick, *Folio*.

Series Chronologica, Olympiadum, Pythiadum, Iſthmiadum, Nemeadum, Quibus Veteres Græci Tempora ſua Metiebantur, per *Gulielmum Lloyd*, A. M. Epiſcopi *Wigornienſis* filium. *Fol.*

Cambridge Concordance.

Baker's Chronicle.

Prince *Arthur*, by Sir *Richard Blackmore.*

---- His Paraphraſe on the Book of *Job*, &c.

Dryden's Fables.

An Expoſition on the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*, by the Biſhop of *Sarum.*

The Folly and Unreaſonableneſs of Atheiſm demonſtrated from the Advantage and Pleaſure of a Religious Life: The Faculties of Humane Souls: The Structure of Animate Bodies, and the Origine and Frame of the World; In Eight Sermons: Preached at the Lecture, Founded by the Honourable *Robert Boyle*, Eſq; in the Firſt Year, 1692.

Of Revelation, and the Meſſias: A Sermon preached at the Publick Commencement at *Cambridge*, *July* the 5*th.* 1696. Both by *Richard Bentley*, D. D. Chaplain in Ordinary, Library-Keeper to his Majeſty, and Maſter of *Trinity* Colledge in *Cambridge.*

An Hiſtorical Examination of the Authority of General Councils, ſhewing the Falſe Dealing that hath been uſed in the publiſhing of them; and the Difference amongſt the Papiſts themſelves about their Number. The Second Edition Corrected 4*to.* By *Robert Jenkin* late Fellow of St. *John*'s Colledge in *Cambridge.*

The Reſtoring of Fallen Brethren; containing the Subſtance of two Sermons on *Gal.* VI.

VI. 1, 2. preached at the Performance of Publick Penance, by certain Criminals, on the Lord's Day, uſually called *Mid-Lent-Sunday*, 1696. in the Pariſh-Church of *Old Swinford* in *Worceſterſhire*; by *Simon Ford*, D. D. and Rector there: with a Preface, by the Right Reverend Father in God *Edward* Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*.

Some Diſcourſes, Sermons and Remains of the Reverend Mr. *Joſ. Glanvill*, late Rector of *Bathe*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majeſty; collected into one Volume, and publiſhed by *Anthony Horneck*, D. D. Preacher at the *Savoy*; with a Sermon preached at his Funeral, by *Joſeph Pleydell* Archdeacon of *Chicheſter*, 4*to*.

Knowledge and Practice; or a plain Diſcourſe of the chief things neceſſary to be known, believed and practiſed, in order to Salvation, with a Supplement, by *Samuel Cradock*. A Book neceſſary to be read in Families, 4*to*.

The Countrey mans Recreation; or the Art of Planting, Grafting and Gardening.

The Unreaſonableneſs of a Separation from the new Biſhops: Or a Treatiſe about Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, ſhewing that although a Biſhop was unjuſtly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a Separation, if the Succeſſor was not an Heretick, in 4*to*.

The Caſe of Sees vacant by an Unjuſt or Uncanonical Deprivation ſtated, in Reply to a Treatiſe entituled, A Vindication of the Deprived Biſhops, *&c.* together with the ſeveral other Pamphlets lately publiſhed as Anſwers to the *Baroccian* Treatiſe; both by *Humphry Hody*, D. D. Fellow of *Wadham* College in *Oxford*.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature of Idolatry; in which a late Author's true and only Notion of Idolatry is conſidered and confuted, 4*to*.

Proteſtant Certainty, or a ſhort Treatiſe ſhewing how a Proteſtant may be well aſſured of the Articles of his Faith, 4*to*.

A Diſſertation upon the Epiſtles of *Phalaris*: with an Anſwer to the Objections of the Honourable *Charles Boyle*, Eſq; By *Richard Bentley*, D. D. 8*vo*. To which may be added, a Chronological Account of the Life of *Pythagoras* and other Famous Men his Contemporaries; with an Epiſtle to the Reverend Dr. *Bentley* about *Porphyry*'s and *Jamblichus*'s Lives of *Pythagoras*; by the Right Reverend Father in God *William* Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*.

Ten Sermons preached before her Royal Highneſs the Princeſs *Anne* of *Denmark*, at the Chappel at St. *James*'s; by *Lewis Atterbury*, L. L. D. and one of the Six Preachers to her Royal Highneſs.

The Happy Aſcetick, or the Beſt Exerciſe; together with Prayers ſuitable to each Exerciſe: To which is added, a Letter to a Perſon of Quality, concerning the Holy Lives of the Primitive Chriſtians, 8*vo*.

Delight and Judgment Repreſented, in a Diſcourſe concerning the great Day of Judgment, and its power to damp and embitter Senſual Delights, Sports and Recreations, 8*vo*.

The Exerciſe of Prayer; or a Help to Devotion: containing Prayers and Devotions for Several Occaſions, Theſe three by *Anthony Horneck*, D. D. late Preacher at the *Savoy*.

Several

Several Eſſays in Political Arithmetick, concerning the Multiplication of Mankind and the growth of the City of *London*: Obſervations on the *Dublin* Bills, or Accounts of the Houſes, Hearths, Baptiſms and Burials in that City: Concerning the People, Houſing, Hoſpitals, *&c.* of *London* and *Paris*, proving that *London* has as many People as *Paris*, *Rome* and *Rouen* put together; with a Diſcourſe concerning the Extent and Value of Lands, People, Buildings, Husbandry, Manufactures, Commerce, Fiſhery, Artizans, Seamen, Soldiers, Publick Revenues, Intereſt, Taxes, *&c.* as the ſame relates to every Countrey in general, but more particularly to the Territories of his Majeſty of Great *Britain*, *Holland*, *Zealand* and *France*; by Sir *William Petty*, late Fellow of the Royal Society, in 8*vo*.

The New State of *England* under our preſent Monarch King *William* the Third, in three Parts; containing 1ſt. A General Account of *England*, with a particular Deſcription of its ſeveral Counties, Cities, Univerſities, Markets and Borough-Towns; and a Survey of *Wales*. 2d. Of the Original, Temper, Genius, Language, Trade, Religion and Government of the *Engliſh*, of the King's Prerogative, Power, Court and Revenues, *&c.* Of the Nobility and Gentry, Clergy and Commonalty: with a ſuccinct Hiſtory of the Kings and Queens of *England* to this time. 3d. A Deſcription of the High Court of Parliament, Privy Council, and all Courts of Judicature, and a Catalogue of the preſent Officers in Church and State: The Third Edition, with great Improvements, in 8*vo*.

Theogra-

Theographia, or a new Art of Short-hand; being a more Natural, Grammatical, and Eaſie Method than any yet Extant: Originally invented by *Abraham Nicholas*, A. M. Enlarged and Publiſhed by *Thomas Sclater*, and approved of by the ableſt Penmen in *London*: The Fourth Edition, 8*vo*.

The Clerk's Tutor in Chancery, giving true Directions by Authentick Precedents how to draw Affidavits, Interlocutory Orders, Reports before Maſters, Bills, Anſwers, Pleas and Demurrers, with ſuch Proceſs, Proceedings and other Inſtruments relating thereunto, as are now in uſe in that High and Honourable Court: To which is prefixed an Introduction with ſome Caſes of Note lately adjudged, and ſeveral new Orders made for the Regulating the practice thereof: The Second Edition with large Additions.

The Practice of his Majeſty's Court of Exchequer at *Weſtminſter*, as to Proceedings in Equity by *Engliſh* Bill, parallel to the Courſe uſed in the High Court of Chancery; containing Precedents of the moſt Exact and Authentick Forms of Bills, Anſwers, Pleas and Demurrers, Interlocutory Orders, Commiſſions, Injunctions, Affidavits, Interrogatories, and ſuch other Proceſs and Pleadings as have been drawn by the moſt Learned, Able and Experienced Council, Clerks and Practitioners; and approved of by the ſaid Court for more than 35 Years laſt paſt, in 8*vo*.

Plutarch's Lives in 5 Volumes.

Kilburn's Preſidents, a new Edition with large Additions.

Sir *William Temple*'s Letters.

Dorrington's Travels into *Germany*, &c.

Veteres

Veteres Vindicati: In an Expoſtulatory Letter to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*, upon his *Conſenſus Veterum*, &c. wherein the abſurdity of his Method, and the weakneſs of his Reaſons are ſhewn; His falſe Aſperſions upon the Church of *England* are wiped off, and her Faith concerning the Euchariſt proved to be that of the Primitive Church: Together with Animadverſions on Dean *Boileu*'s French Tranſlation of, and Remarks upon *Bertram*.

An Anſwer to the Compiler of *Nubes Teſtium*: Wherein is ſhewn, That Antiquity (in relation to the Points in Controverſie ſet down by him) did not for the firſt five hundred Years Believe, Teach and Practice as the Church of *Rome* doth at preſent Believe, Teach and Practice; Together with a Vindication of *Veteres Vindicati* from the late weak and diſingenuous Attempts of the Author of Tranſubſtantiation Defended, by the Author of the Anſwer to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*.

A Letter to Father *Lewis Sabran* Jeſuit, in anſwer to his Letter to a Peer of the Church of *England*; wherein the Poſtſcript to the Anſwer to the *Nubes Teſtium* is Vindicated, and Father *Sabran*'s Miſtakes farther diſcover'd.

A ſecond Letter to Father *Lewis Sabran* Jeſuit, in anſwer to his Reply.

A Vindication of the Principles of the Author of the Anſwer to the Compiler of *Nubes Teſtium* in anſwer to a late pretended Letter from a Diſſenter to the Divines of the Church of *England*. The Five by Dr. *Gee*, Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majeſty.

The Remains of Sir *Walter Rawleigh*, containing his Maxims of State: Advice to his Son:

Son: His Son's Advice to his Father: His Sceptick: Obſervations concerning the Cauſes of Magnificency and Opulency of Cities: His Obſervations touching Trade and Commerce with the *Hollander* and other Nations; proving that our Sea and Land Commodities inrich and ſtrengthen other Countries againſt our own: His Letters to divers Perſons of Quality: The Prerogative of Parliaments in *England*, prov'd in a Dialogue between a Councellor of State and a Juſtice of Peace, in 12's.

The Common-Prayer-Book the Beſt Companion to prepare Communicants for the Lord's Supper, being a Preparatory Office Collected out of the Liturgy of the Church of *England*; to which are prefixed Perſwaſive Diſcourſes to prove the Dignity of that Holy Sacrament and the neceſſity of receiving it, in 12's.

The New-years-gift compleat, in ſix Parts, compoſed of Meditations and Prayers for every Day in the Week; with Devotions for the Sacrament, Lent, and other Occaſions, in 12's. The Firſt Part may be had by it ſelf, in 12's.

The Chriſtian Pattern, or a Divine Treatiſe of the Imitation of Chriſt, written Originally in Latin by *Thomas of Kempis* above 200 years ſince, newly Tranſlated, in 24's.

A Choice Manual, or Rare Secrets in Phyſick and Chirurgery; collected and practiſed by the Right Honourable the Counteſs of *Kent* late deceaſed: whereto are added ſeveral Experiments of the Vertue of *Gaſcon*'s Powder and *Lapis contra Yarvam*, by a Profeſſor of Phyſick; as alſo moſt exquiſite ways of

of Preſerving, Conſerving, Candying and Cookery, in 24's.

Cloſet-Devotions to a devout and worthy Reception of the Lord's Supper; with Directions and Prayers for the more profitable Exerciſe of our private Religion in the ſtate of our progreſs and improvement in the Chriſtian Life, in 24's.

School-Books ſold by *Henry Mortlock*.

HOratius, Interpretatione & Notis illuſtravit Ludovidus Des Prez, in uſum Delfini. Huic Editione acceſſere vita Horatii cum Dacerii Chronologia Horatiana, & Præfatio de Satyra Romana, 8*vo*.

L. Annæus Florus, in uſum Delfini, 8*vo*.

Juſtin, in uſum Delfini.

Leuſdeni Compendium Græcum Novi Teſtamenti, in 8*vo*. Quinta Editio.

Janua Linguarum Trilinguis, ſive Johannis Amos Comenii Janua Linguarum, 8*vo*.

Græcæ Grammatices Rudimenta in uſum Scholæ Weſtmonaſterienſis.

Busby's Apollodorus, in uſum Scholæ Weſtmonaſterienſis.

Nomenclatura Brevis Reformata, in uſum Scholæ Weſtmonaſt.

An Engliſh Introduction to the Latine Tongue, for the uſe of the Lower Forms in *Weſtminſter* School.

Græca Epigrammata, in uſ. Scholæ Weſt.

Martialis Epigram. in uſum Scholæ Weſt.

Juvenal in uſum Scholæ Weſtmonaſt.

A General Examination of the Common Greek Grammar, according to Dr. *Busby*'s method, chiefly intended for grounding young Beginners

Beginners in the Greek Tongue, in the Free-School in *Newark* upon *Trent*.

Selectæ Demosthenis Orationes in usum Scholarum, 12's.

A short Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of *England*, with the Church-Catechism it self, and order of Confirmation in English and Latin, the Latin revised and much amended, by *Edw. Boughn*, D. D. fitted for the use of Schools.

An Explanation of the Additional Rules for the Genders of Nouns in the *Oxford* Grammar, by way of Question and Answer: by *John Twells* Master of the Free-School in *Newark*; very proper to be bound up with the *Oxford* Grammar.

Solomon's Proverbs English and Latin, Alphabetically collected for the help of Memory, and fitted for the use of Schools, 12's.

With variety of other School-Books.

IMPRIMATUR
11 DE 72

THE END.